

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1984

A Critical Analysis of Helen Keller's Socialist Speaking

Nancy J. Nelson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Nelson, Nancy J., "A Critical Analysis of Helen Keller's Socialist Speaking" (1984). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4228.

<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/4228>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HELEN KELLER'S
SOCIALIST SPEAKING

BY

NANCY J. NELSON

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Arts, Major in
Speech, South Dakota
State University
1984

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HELEN KELLER'S
SOCIALIST SPEAKING

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Master of Arts, and is acceptable for meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this thesis does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Wayne E. Hoogestraat
Thesis Adviser

Date

Judith Zivanovic
Head, Department of Speech

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Wayne Hoogestraat--

it's always a joy to meet people who make you
feel good about yourself.

And to my mother and in memory of her mother--

their lives are a constant inspiration to me.

NJN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Origin of Study	1
Purpose of Investigation	4
Methodology of the Investigation	5
Endnotes	11
II. THE RHETORICAL SETTING	12
Helen Keller--Biographical Sketch	12
The Socialist Movement in the United States (1901-1918)	17
Helen Keller's Rhetorical Involvement in The Socialist Movement	28
Diminishing Role in Socialist Rhetoric	35
Endnotes	38
III. THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS	44
Textural Authenticity	44
Historical Background of Speeches	45
Basis of the Criteria for the Rhetorical Analysis	47
Invention	48
Arrangement	91
Style	101
Delivery	119
Effects of the Rhetoric	125
Endnotes	129
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	132
Summary	132
Conclusions	135
Recommendations for Further Study	136
APPENDIX A	138
APPENDIX B	141
APPENDIX C	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY	148

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin of Study

Helen Keller's life has been an inspiration to many throughout the world. Although she may be best known for her work on behalf of the blind and the deaf, Helen Keller was also an active participant in the American Socialist Movement. After joining the Socialist Party in 1909, her writings and speeches frequently reflected concern for the working class and her opposition to World War I. After 1921, Keller made the decision to devote the rest of her life to working for the American Foundation for the Blind, thus, terminating her active period of rhetorical efforts for the Socialist Party.

When considering a study on the rhetoric of Helen Keller on behalf of the Socialist movement, an investigation of the subject revealed a number of reasons indicating that the subject was deserving of further study. Since few people may be aware of the role she played in the Socialist movement, and because there has been a limited amount published on this period of Keller's life, further study appeared to be justified. As revealed in the methodology section, it was found that no other evaluative studies have

been completed on Keller's rhetoric during this period.

Helen Keller, nevertheless, was a prominent person. She is the subject or author of at least nine books:

Brooks, Van Wyck. Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1956.

Foner, Philip S. Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years. New York: International Publishers Company, 1967.

Gibson, William. The Miracle Worker. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981.

Giffin, Frederick C., ed. Woman as Revolutionary. New York: A Mentor Book, 1973.

Helen Keller's Journal. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1938.

Keller, Helen. Midstream: My Later Life. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

Keller, Helen. My Religion. New York: Swedenborg Foundation, 1972.

Keller, Helen. The Story of My Life. New York: Lancer Books, 1968.

Lash, Joseph P. Helen and Teacher. New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1980.

Although the above-mentioned books do briefly mention Keller's involvement in the Socialist Party, none include a concentrated investigation of Keller's rhetorical practices. Two minor exceptions include Lash's book, Helen and Teacher, which was a biography of Keller's entire life. It did include a comprehensive section on Keller's Socialist involvement, but it was not a rhetorical analysis of her speeches. Foner's book, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years, was also an excellent source for purposes of this

study. It included the texts of a number of speeches by Keller during this period, as well as letters and essays written by Keller. Foner's book provided valuable information about Keller's involvement in the Socialist movement, however, it contained no rhetorical analysis of her speeches.

As this study progressed, it was discovered that a new play had been produced on the subject of Ann Sullivan and Helen Keller. The play is entitled, Monday After the Miracle. According to Ms. magazine, November 1982, the play is a sequel to the original play on Keller, The Miracle Worker. At the date of the magazine's publication, the new play was running at the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C., moving to Broadway at the end of November.¹

The substantial amount of literature by or about Keller provided another reason for an evaluative study of Keller's Socialist rhetoric.

Keller's political involvement in the Socialist movement may not be known to many people. Because of this, an inquiry into Keller's rhetoric on behalf of the Socialist movement was deemed appropriate. This study may serve to increase the awareness of the role Keller played in the movement, as well as the nature of her rhetoric during this period.

Another consideration in undertaking this study was the choice of the Socialist movement speeches rather than

the speeches Keller delivered on behalf of the blind and the deaf. Since no researcher has unlimited time to conduct a study, the Socialist movement speeches were chosen rather than those delivered for the blind and the deaf which would have been too voluminous for the present inquiry. The choice made the inquiry more manageable.

Purpose of the Investigation

The purpose of this inquiry was to determine the effectiveness and the effect of the Socialistic rhetoric of Helen Keller as revealed in selected speeches on behalf of the Socialist movement. For purposes of this study it was necessary to define effectiveness and effect. Effectiveness refers to how well the rhetorical choices matched the established criteria. The effect is the immediate and long-range audience responses to Keller's rhetoric.

To accomplish the stated purpose, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. What was the historical background of the American Socialist Movement during the period in which these speeches were presented?
2. What were the inventional components in each of the selected speeches? What were the themes presented in each of the speeches, the forms of support, the lines of reasoning?

3. What was the structure of the chosen speeches, and what was the effectiveness of the arrangement?

4. What stylistic choices did Keller make and what was the effectiveness of these choices? In what ways did her speeches adhere to the qualities of correctness, clearness, appropriateness, and embellishment?

5. What were the practices of delivery used by Helen Keller, and what was the effectiveness of these practices?

6. What were the immediate and long-range effects these speeches had in terms of audience responses?

Methodology of the Investigation

1. The first step taken in this study was to conduct a survey of certain indexes to determine if any previous inquiries had been made relating to the rhetoric of Helen Keller on behalf of the Socialist movement. A review of the following guides revealed that no other thesis on the rhetoric of Helen Keller had been completed:

Comprehensive Dissertation Index 1861-1972. Volumes 27, 28, 29, 31 (Michigan: Xerox University Microfilm, 1973). Language and Literature, Law and Political Science, History, Mass Communications, Speech and Theatre.

Comprehensive Dissertation Indexes (1973-1980 Supplements), Volume 4 (Michigan: Xerox University Microfilm, 1974-1981). History, Language and Literature, Law and Political Science.

This review also revealed that no studies on any aspect of Helen Keller's life contributions had been reported.

2. Following the survey of literature, the next step was to obtain texts of speeches to be used in the study. Six of Helen Keller's speeches were discovered. The titles of these speeches and the dates on which they were given follows:

"Social Causes of Blindness," February 14, 1911.²

"A New Light is Coming," July 8, 1913 (date speech was published in the New York Call).³

"Menace of the Militarist Program," December 19, 1915.⁴

"Strike Against War," January 5, 1916.⁵

"What is the IWW?," January 1918.⁶

"Onward, Comrades!," December 31, 1920.⁷

3. The third step was to choose the specific speeches for analysis. The number of speeches to be analyzed was limited to three so as to make the task manageable and still give a reasonably representative sample. It was then decided that the most objective method in choosing the three speeches would be to randomly draw the titles of the speeches, and to use those drawn for the study. The following speeches were drawn:

"A New Light is Coming," 1913.

"Menace of the Militarist Program," 1915.

"What is the IWW?," 1918.

It should be noted that there is some chronological representation in the choice.

4. The fourth step was to determine the textual authenticity of the chosen texts. The texts of the speeches analyzed in this study were obtained from Philip S. Foner's book, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years. Foner obtained two of the speeches from the New York Call, a Socialist daily paper published in the United States from 1908-1923. It is possible that these speeches are not the original texts, since there is the possibility of inaccurate reporting of her speeches. Except for this, there appears to be no other reason to believe that these speeches are not the original texts. Nevertheless, additional efforts were undertaken to determine textual authenticity. Suggestions offered by Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden in their book, Speech Criticism, were followed.⁸

5. The fifth step was to collect and to organize the historical data surrounding each speech in order to answer the first question raised under the statement of purpose.

6. The sixth step was an attempt to discover Keller's reasons for abandoning her Socialistic rhetoric. It was necessary to examine Keller's biographies, autobiographies and news accounts to arrive at a probable cause.

7. The seventh step was to establish the criteria to be used for the rhetorical analysis. The standards offered by Lester Thonssen, A Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden in their book, Speech Criticism, and referred to as the judicial type of criticism were used. This judicial method:

. . . reconstructs a speech situation with fidelity to fact; it examines this situation carefully in the light of the interaction of speaker, audience, subject, and occasion; it interprets the data with an eye to determining the effect of the speech; it formulates a judgment in the light of the philosophical-historical-literary-logical-ethical constituents of the inquiry; and it appraises the entire event by assigning it comparative rank in the total enterprise of speaking.

8. The eighth step was to determine the inventional components in each of these speeches. To determine the inventional components and the effectiveness of these choices it was necessary to analyze each speech text, to refer to news accounts following her speeches, to examine biographies and autobiographies of Helen Keller and to review the historical data collected concerning the political atmosphere during this period. From this analysis a comprehensive statement of her inventional choices and the effectiveness of these choices was formulated.

9. The ninth step was to determine the methods of arrangement which Keller followed. This was attempted by analyzing the arrangement of each speech, using Thonssen, Baird, and Braden's Speech Criticism as a critical guide.

After this, an attempt was made to determine the effectiveness of the arrangement of the speeches in terms of the established criteria.

10. The tenth step was to determine how effectively the qualities of style were used in these speeches. Effectiveness of choices concerning correctness, clearness, appropriateness, and embellishment was judged by analyzing each speech text and comparing the stylistic choices to the established criteria.

11. The next step was to determine Keller's practices in delivery and the effectiveness of these practices. It was necessary to draw on secondary accounts of Keller's speaking in order to determine her practices of delivery. Again the effectiveness of her delivery was assessed in terms of the established criteria.

12. The next step was to attempt to determine the immediate and long-range responses to Keller's speeches. It was necessary to examine both Keller's estimate of responses, and accounts of societal responses. Keller's estimate of responses was found in autobiographical data, and in her reactions to her speeches as recorded in news accounts and biographies. Societal responses were sought by looking at accounts of resulting social change.

13. The final step was to draw conclusions concerning the effectiveness and the effect of Helen Keller's Socialist rhetoric.

The remaining portion of this thesis includes a chapter on the rhetorical setting. This chapter includes a biographical sketch of Keller, a brief history of the Socialist Party of America from 1901-1918, and a sketch of Keller's rhetorical involvement in the Socialist movement. The third chapter includes a rhetorical analysis of the three speeches chosen for evaluation. The final chapter is a summary and includes conclusions drawn from the study.

ENDNOTES

¹Susan Dworkin, "The Passion for a Thinking Woman's Theatre," Ms., November, 1982, p. 70.

²Philip S. Foner, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years (New York: International Publishers Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 29-30.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 52-54.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 75-81.

⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 91-93.

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.

⁸Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden, Speech Criticism, 2nd ed. (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1970), pp. 323-343.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 21.

CHAPTER II

THE RHETORICAL SETTING

Helen Keller--Biographical Sketch

Helen Keller was born in Tuscumbia, Alabama on June 27, 1880,¹ to confederate Army Captain, Arthur Keller and his wife, Kate Adams.² Helen was born with the ability to see and to hear. In Keller's first autobiography, The Story of My Life, she explained that at six months she started speaking words.³ By the age of one, she had learned to walk.⁴ Van Wyck Brooks' biography of Keller explains that at eighteen months Helen suffered an illness which left her premanently blind and deaf.⁵ In Keller's autobiography she described the illness as an "acute congestion of the stomach and brain."⁶

As Brooks stated, Sullivan arrived in Tuscumbia from the Perkins Institution, a training school for the blind in Boston.⁷ Prior to this, Helen's father had been directed by an oculist to go to Alexander Graham Bell to see what could be done to help Helen. Bell had advised Arthur Keller to write to the Perkins Institution and ask for a teacher for Helen.⁸ In 1887, Anne Sullivan was the teacher chosen to help her. Sullivan was successful in her efforts to help Helen realize the connection between names and things. Helen first made the connection when she

realized that the word "water" was the same as the water which came out of the water pump.⁹ Interestingly, in her autobiography, Keller explained that "water" was one of the words she learned as a child before her illness.¹⁰ Apparently, Keller had retained valuable information from her experiences prior to her illness.

Helen learned quickly after this initial connection was made. Sullivan taught by exposing her to her surroundings. For example, Helen described in The Story of My Life how Sullivan introduced her to botany by having her feel various flowers and trees. Helen learned about zoology by Sullivan's describing with her fingers the animals around the Keller's home.¹¹ In 1888, only a year after Sullivan's arrival, Helen and Anne Sullivan left for Boston to visit the Perkins Institution to allow the director there to meet Helen.¹² In the book, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, Brooks explains that Helen and Sullivan spent most of Helen's childhood in the Northeast. During this time, there were frequent return visits to Tuscumbia, but while in Boston they usually lived at the Institution.¹³

In a report by Anne Sullivan, as recorded in Helen's autobiography, Sullivan explained that Helen was not put into a structured educational system during her childhood primarily because it was characteristic of Helen

to ask questions on her own about a variety of topics. Thus, it was decided that it would be better for Helen to learn at her own accelerated rate since she needed little encouragement.¹⁴ According to Brooks, after Helen met Michael Anagnos, director of the Perkins Institution, Anagnos widely publicized what Helen had accomplished despite her physical disabilities. Helen met many celebrities in Boston, such as, Phillips Brooks and Oliver Wendell Holmes.¹⁵ She considered Alexander Graham Bell and Mark Twain her best friends.¹⁶

According to Keller's biographer, Joseph P. Lash, in 1896, at the age of sixteen, Helen entered the Gilman School for Young Ladies in Cambridge. Sullivan went to each class with Helen and helped her to prepare her lessons. Helen's education and living expenses for both Helen and Sullivan were financed with funds raised by friends and others interested in Helen.¹⁷ Apparently the publicity generated by Anagnos had interested enough people in Helen to even support her education.

Helen later passed her entrance examinations for Radcliffe College. She enrolled in 1900, at the age of twenty.¹⁸ According to Brooks, after Helen's graduation from Radcliffe in 1904, Sullivan and Helen bought a farmhouse and a seven-acre farm at Wrentham near Boston.¹⁹ A year later, in 1905, Sullivan married John Macy.²⁰ Anne

Sullivan was obviously not only Helen's childhood teacher but was also her companion, since both Sullivan and her new husband became a part of Helen's household.

Keller's biographer, Van Wyck Brooks, explains that Macy and Helen shared many of the same literary tastes. Macy also became an influential person in Helen's life.²¹ In the years which followed Macy's marriage to Sullivan in 1905, until 1909 Helen spent much of her time at Wrentham in personal study. She also wrote a number of essays which were later published.²² Lash points out that it was in 1909 that Helen joined the Socialist Party.²³ Apparently this period of studying and writing with Macy influenced Helen in making some important changes in her life, one being her choice to become a Socialist.

Lash explained that during the next few years after 1909, Helen lectured throughout the country on a variety of subjects. Also during this period, Macy and Sullivan were frequently separated. Macy claimed that Anne Sullivan spent too much time with Helen which created tension in their marriage.²⁴

The lecturing continued to bring Helen and Sullivan more fame. In 1914, Polly Thomson joined Helen and Sullivan as a secretary, to aid in the 1915 lecture tour which was handled by the Pond Lecture Bureau. Thomson remained with Helen the rest of her life.²⁵ With

these other two members of the household, Polly and Helen, John Macy may have been justified in his claims that Sullivan made Helen's life her priority.

In 1919, "Deliverance," a film on Helen's life, was produced. Helen did not attend the film's opening however, since the Actors Equity was on strike and she refused to cross the picket line.²⁶ Helen was apparently still dedicated to political action evidenced by her decision not to attend her own film.

In Keller's biography, Helen and Teacher, the author states that in 1919, Helen and Sullivan joined the vaudeville circuit. Helen and Sullivan considered the pay to be sufficient, and felt it would be less physically tiring than lecturing.²⁷ Helen's vaudeville act usually consisted of an introduction of Helen by Sullivan, followed by a short speech by Helen.²⁸ Shrinking vaudeville engagements helped to end their activities in 1922.²⁹

Two years later, in 1924, after Sullivan's extensive negotiations on the terms of the public appearances, Helen began her fund raising activities for the American Foundation for the Blind.³⁰ It is obvious that Sullivan proved to be even more than Helen's teacher and friend, but also played an important role in Helen's career and financial security.

After 1924, Helen also dedicated much of her time to writing. Lash points out that Helen finished the book, My Religion in 1927,³¹ and completed her second autobiography, Midstream: My Later Life, in 1929.³²

After this time, according to Brooks, Anne Sullivan's health gradually declined, and her eyes steadily grew weaker until she became totally blind. In 1936, Anne Sullivan died.³³ After Sullivan's death, Helen traveled extensively throughout the world. Brooks reported that Helen toured Japan the year after Sullivan's death to lecture on behalf of the blind.³⁴ Brooks also mentions in Keller's biography that during World War II, Helen continued to travel throughout the world, visiting the wounded soldiers in Europe. Following WW II, from 1946 to 1952, her touring continued. She toured Europe, Australia, Japan, South Africa, Israel and Egypt. She always spoke on behalf of the blind during these tours.³⁵

In the late 1950s, Helen became less active, and Lash stated that in 1960, Polly Thomson died. Only a year later Helen suffered her first stroke and retired from public life.³⁶ Seven years later, in 1968, Helen Keller died.³⁷

The Socialist Movement in the United States (1901-1918)

This section is concerned with the Socialist Movement in America between 1901-1918, from the founding

of the Socialist Party of America in 1901, to 1918, the date of the last of Keller's speeches analyzed in this study.

Origins of the Party

The Socialist Party of America was founded in July 1901 in Indianapolis. It was created by a number of the Socialist groups that had been organized in the United States after the Civil War. Many of the groups which united that day came from such organizations as the Populist Party, the American Railway Union and the Grangers, with such leaders as Morris Hillquit and Eugene Debs.³⁸ According to David Shannon, in his book, The Socialist Party of America, "the party's real origins lay in the revolt against the social and economic conditions created by the mushrooming industrialism of America after the Civil War."³⁹

Industrialism had created a significant difference in the distribution of wealth in America. In the late 1890s, as Patrick Renshaw stated, in his book, The Wobblies, "\$700 a year was considered the minimum on which a family could be raised without serious hardship."⁴⁰ Yet, at the time, about one-third of the mine and factory workers made well under \$500 a year. Along side these conditions for many workers, there were also the wealthy industrialists, such as John D. Rockefeller, who controlled the majority of

this country's petroleum trade.⁴¹ As the Socialist Party of America grew, its membership consisted of both the wealthy and the poor.

Eugene Debs, one of the more well-known Socialist leaders, believed that there needed to be a change in the employer and worker relationship in the United States. According to the book, Debs, early in Debs' life he had worked on the railroad, and it was through that experience that he realized that many workers in the United States lived in extreme poverty. Debs also firmly believed that not all men could do what they wished with their lives, and that it was private property that kept the worker and the employer separated.⁴² Ronald Radosh reported that it was because of these beliefs that Debs supported and worked for the Socialist Party of America until his death. Debs' work included five unsuccessful bids for the presidency of the United States on the Socialist ticket.⁴³

Debs, however, was not the only powerful Socialist leader of his time. According to Shannon, Debs' contemporary Morris Hillquit, was, for a long time, the leader of the New York Socialists. Hillquit and many of his fellow New York Socialists belonged to the more conservative Socialists. These conservative Socialists advocated a change in the present system which would come about not by revolution, but gradually through political action.⁴⁴

The more radical or militant group in the Socialist Movement was the Industrial Workers of the World, or the Wobblies. Renshaw said that the IWW was founded in 1905, and was working for the day when all wage earners would belong to the one large union. The IWW believed that a number of strikes over the years would eventually lead to a general strike,⁴⁵ which would then result in the formation of one union.⁴⁶

Growth and Development

Although the IWW was formed in 1905, it was not until four years later that it gained the kind of national attention it desired. According to Renshaw, in 1909, the IWW played a significant role in the strike of the Pressed Steel Car Company in McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania. The dispute had begun when the company decided to abandon the fixed wage system for its workers. This meant that workers would be paid strictly on the basis of how much they could produce. The workers objected to the new system, and six thousand workers struck.⁴⁷ The strike lasted two months. In the course of the strike, the IWW established a local IWW. Shortly after this, a violent dispute among strikers and state troopers resulted in the death of eleven persons.⁴⁸ As reported in the New York Times, soon after this episode, on September 8, 1909, the company was forced to return to the fixed wage system and

the workers returned to work.⁴⁹ According to Renshaw, the IWW gained national attention and respect for the role it played in the strike.⁵⁰

Just as the IWW was gaining public attention for its activities, so was the Socialist Party of America. As Shannon reported, Chicago and Milwaukee were beginning to become prominent Socialist cities.⁵¹ Victor Berger became the heart of the Socialist Party of America in Milwaukee. The Milwaukee organization was opposed to the IWW and their militant actions, and supported the rise of Socialism through political action.⁵² In 1910, Victor Berger was elected to the Congress of the United States, and other Milwaukee Socialists won municipal elections that same year.⁵³

Socialism moved into the Midwest at about the same time that Berger was elected to Congress. In the book, The Socialist Party of America, it was recorded that Socialism took on an almost religious meaning to the people there. Outdoor meetings, called encampments, offered the opportunity for farmers to get together usually once a year. The week-long meetings included speeches, music, and classes which were centered around Socialism.⁵⁴ Although the farmers did attend, it is likely that they did not stay for the entire week. They probably only stayed for a day or two, considering their responsibilities to the farm.

According to Shannon, the speakers were an important element in the meetings which often brought in as many as five thousand participants. Eugene Debs and Kate Richards O'Hare were the most popular speakers. O'Hare was also instrumental in registering a large number of farmers into the Socialist Party of America.⁵⁵

As Socialism moved further west into the Rocky Mountains and to the coast, the IWW ruled much of their Socialist activity. As stated in the book, The Socialist Party of America:

That such contempt for law and political action as this was popular among the miners and lumber-jacks of the Western mountains is not surprising when one considers society in that area. Here there were no niceties in industrial warfare. . . . Where a laborer's only contact with the state had been through a labor injunction, a trumped-up criminal indictment, or a troopers' bayonet, such contempt for the state and parliamentary action was to be expected of men of integrity. If many Western Socialists were tough, hard-bitten, and primitive,⁵⁶ so were the conditions from which they came.

Back in the East, strikers dominated the mill towns. As reported in the New York Times, on January 12, 1912 workers struck the Lawrence Textile Mills because of an objection by workers to their cut in pay due to a newly-enacted fifty-four hour a week law. With the new law, workers would lose pay for two hours per week.⁵⁷ Renshaw stated that before the strike ended on March 18, 1912, the IWW had joined the strikers and had sent in organizer Joseph Ettor and a former Italian labor paper

editor, Arturo Giovannitti to aid the strikers.⁵⁸ According to Joseph P. Lash, in the book, Helen and Teacher, as the strike wore on, "a woman striker was killed, and Giovanitti and Ettor were charged with being accomplices to the murder."⁵⁹ As reported in the New York Times, both men were later acquitted. The persistence of the IWW paid off. The strikers at the Lawrence Mills went back to work on March 18, 1912 after the nine-week strike which had put 22,000 employees out of work.⁶⁰ Lash explained that the workers' pay cuts were restored, and this strike was viewed as another victory for the IWW and one of its leaders, William D. Haywood.⁶¹

Although the IWW was effective in its role in the Lawrence Strike, its militant activities were questioned even by the Socialist Party of America. Shannon said that later in 1912, at the Socialist National Convention, its members made some significant changes in its constitution. The Socialist Party of America decided to amend their constitution and take a position against sabotage, and "to provide for the expulsion of any member who opposes political action or advocates crime against the person or other methods of violence."⁶² According to Radosh, Debs advocated the ban on sabotage in 1912,⁶³ however, Haywood, of the IWW was not opposed to the use of violence.⁶⁴ Shannon stated that not long after the

revision in 1913, Haywood was recalled by a vote of party members from the party's National Executive Committee. Haywood later left the Socialist Party of America.⁶⁵ The Socialist Party of America began to gradually become a more conservative organization,⁶⁰ while the IWW continued its militant activities.

When World War I began in Europe in 1914, as recorded in the book, The Socialist Party of America, the American Socialists announced their position on the war. The majority of American Socialists and many of their leaders, Debs and Hillquit included, were opposed to the war. They believed the war was not a fight for "democracy, culture or progress," but was a fight for power and to gain advantages for the ruling class.⁶⁹ One step the IWW and some other Socialists took in an effort to keep the United States out of war was to support a general strike of American workers. As reported by the New York Times, when there was talk of a possible war between Mexico and the United States, Haywood predicted the workers would oppose it by a general strike. The IWW, however, received little support from such unions as the United Mine Workers of America, and the idea was abandoned as impractical.⁶⁸

When Wilson announced his preparedness program to the American public, an attempt to increase the United

States' military strength, the majority of Socialists declared opposition to this, too.⁶⁹

Decline

As World War I in Europe continued, American sentiment grew more in support of the war. According to Shannon, the American public was growing suspicious of Socialist ideas as being too sympathetic to Germany. On June 15, 1917, the Espionage Act "granted the federal government the power to censor newspapers and ban them from the mails."⁷⁰ The Socialist periodical, "Appeal to Reason," which had a circulation of over half a million, was a popular periodical to the farmers in the Midwest. The periodicals' June 30, 1917 issue was held by postal authorities for taking an anti-war position.⁷¹ As reported in the New York Times, besides the "Appeal," other Socialist publications were restricted. Another publication, "The American Socialists'" June 19, 1917 issue was held by the St. Louis postmaster for running an ad for a pamphlet, "The Price We Pay," because the paper was opposed to the war.⁷²

Also during that year, many well-known Socialists left the Party. The New York Times reported that John Sparo, who had once been a lecturer for the Socialist Party of America, withdrew his membership. The reasons he gave were that he believed the Party's war program was

"unneutral, un-American, and pro-German."⁷³ The Times also reported that later others followed Sparo's example. Following his announcement, Rose Pastor Stokes and her husband, J. G. Phelps Stokes resigned from the Socialist Party of America. The Stokes had been actively involved in the Party, but resigned because of its opposition to the war.⁷⁴

Nevertheless, the IWW continued its strike activities in the West. Public sentiment, however, was often not in favor of the Wobblies' activities. The New York Times reported that on July 12, 1917, in Bisbee, Arizona over one thousand IWW members were deported to New Mexico in cattle cars. The deportation was authorized by members of the organization called Citizens' Protective League.⁷⁵ Other IWW members throughout the country were deported under similar circumstances.⁷⁶

Then on August 2, 1917, the New York Times reported that in Butte, Montana, an IWW strike organizer was lynched. Frank Little had worked for years as a strike leader, first in Fresno, California, and later helped to organize the Bisbee, Arizona strike. He had also been at the Mesaba Iron Range strike in Minnesota a year before his death. Little's body was found in the early morning outside of Butte, hanging from a railroad trestle. A vigilante warning sign was pinned to his clothing.⁷⁷

American sentiment appeared to be extremely negative toward the IWW and its activities, to the point where some felt threatened enough to resort to murder.

According to Radosh, in 1917, the Socialist leader Eugene Debs was arrested for violating the Espionage Act and remained in jail until 1921 when he was pardoned. Debs died five years later on October 20, 1926.⁷⁸

Yet, despite the increasing obstacles the Socialist Party was experiencing, it still was not dead. According to Shannon, memberships with the Party in the West had declined, but not in the Northeast, where memberships had increased.⁷⁹ As reported by the New York Times, Morris Hillquit continued to lead the New York Socialist Party and believed that the 1918 elections were important to the Socialist candidates and the future of the Socialist Party of America.⁸⁰

On November 11, 1918 World War I ended, but the Socialist Party of America continued to exist.⁸¹

After its formation in 1901, the Socialist Party of America steadily grew throughout the United States for two decades. It survived a number of vast changes which were sometimes gained through violent actions.

Helen Keller's Rhetorical Involvement
in the Socialist Movement

Prior Influences

Upon Helen Keller's graduation from Radcliffe in 1904, she was faced with the difficult decision of what to do with the rest of her life.⁸² According to her autobiography, Midstream: My Later Life, she began her search by studying blindness.⁸³ As she learned more about the living conditions for the blind and the causes of blindness, she realized that there was much about the blind that she did not know. One fact which greatly disturbed her was that nearly two-thirds of the children admitted to schools for the blind were blind because of the disease, ophthalmia neonatorum. Although the disease could be prevented, it was scarcely ever discussed because it was associated with venereal disease.⁸⁴ As reported by Van Wyck Brooks, Helen also made connection between poverty and blindness, since many children were blind as a result of their poor living conditions.⁸⁵

Open to new ideas, Helen continued to study more about the blind. According to Brooks, as mentioned earlier in this thesis, during this period she met John Macy, who was to become an influential person in her life. Macy had assisted Helen with her autobiography, The Story of My Life, which had been completed in 1903. John Macy

and Anne Sullivan, who was eleven years his senior, were married in 1905 and John Macy joined Anne Sullivan and Helen's household.⁸⁶ As mentioned earlier, both Helen and Macy had similar literary interests. Both admired such authors as William James and Mark Twain. As their friendship grew, Macy introduced Helen to the ideals of Socialism.⁸⁷ Helen read the works of Peter Kropotkin and H. G. Wells,⁸⁸ and it was when Helen read H. G. Wells', New Worlds for Old, that she finally concluded that the Socialist point of view was the correct one.⁸⁹

Joining the Socialist Party

In 1909, Helen joined the Socialist Party of America.⁹⁰ Her interests in Socialism steadily increased after she joined the party. According to Lash, Helen began to study the writings of Karl Marx. Her Socialist beliefs became better known to the public through letters which illustrated her Socialist convictions, editorials, and also by speaking.⁹¹ According to Foner, one such speech was, "Social Causes of Blindness," a speech presented on February 14, 1911 to the Massachusetts Association for Promoting the Interests of the Blind in Boston.⁹²

Brooks reported that during this period, Helen actively followed newspaper reports of strike activities, like the Lawrence Strike in 1912. According to Brooks, "she [Helen] had been all for the workers, believing that

the plants should belong to the producers of the goods, and, . . . she felt that Socialism alone could solve these problems."⁹³ Helen even became a friend of one of the leaders of the Lawrence Strike, Giovannitti, and wrote a preface to his book of poems, Arrows in the Gale.

The press, however, had their own opinions of Helen's actions. Brooks reported that in some newspaper articles, reporters suspected that since Helen was blind and deaf that she was being taken advantage of by the Socialist Party of America, which Helen denied.⁹⁴ According to the book, Helen Keller Sketch For a Portrait, Helen saw a definite connection between blindness and her Socialist convictions. She considered supporting Socialism a way to help the blind.⁹⁵

In 1912, John Macy joined the IWW and Helen also became sympathetic to their activities. Soon after Macy had joined the IWW, Helen expressed her support by sending a check in the amount of \$87.50 to aid the workers who were striking the knitting mills in Little Falls, New York.⁹⁶ She not only privately supported the IWW, but must have also felt a need to be more actively involved, as evidenced by this gesture.

Socialist Platform Oratory

Helen began her lecture tours in 1913. In her autobiography, Midstream: My Later Life, she had long

had the desire to improve her speech, and in 1910, with the help of a singing teacher, she began working on becoming a better speaker.

On her lecture tours, she spoke to a wide variety of persons and usually her lectures were words of encouragement to her listeners.⁹⁷ At least one of her speeches in 1913, however, did illustrate her Socialist convictions. The speech, "A New Light is Coming," was presented at the Sociological Conference that year in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts.⁹⁸

On her tour, Helen visited schools for the blind whenever she could find the free time. According to Keller, her visits to and tours of the schools began to change her attitudes about the blind and the deaf. She had once thought that if a person applied themselves they could achieve anything they wanted. But as she toured the country, particularly the mining and manufacturing towns, she realized that not everyone could do what they wanted. She realized how many people had helped her in her life, and saw that her opportunities for education and emotional support were not available to everyone.⁹⁹

In that same year, Andrew Carnegie, a friend of Helen's, offered her an annuity. Three years earlier, he had also offered her an annuity and she had refused because she wished to make her own living. According to

Keller, Carnegie also took a negative view of her Socialist membership, threatening to spank her if she did not change her mind. Helen, not intimidated by Carnegie, refused the annuity and ignored the threat.¹⁰⁰ Helen's Socialist beliefs were gradually shaping all aspects of her life.

In 1914, Helen advocated peace, and declared her position on World War I was "neutral."¹⁰¹ At the same time, she had grown more sympathetic to the IWW and their activities, and spent Thanksgiving that year with the Giovannittis.¹⁰² As reported by Lash, by 1915, Helen's lectures were enjoying large audiences. The tour that year, which had been arranged by the Pond Lecture Bureau, gave Helen the opportunity to meet many famous people like Henry Ford, Enrico Caruso and Dr. Maria Montessori.

In the fall of that year, Helen and Sullivan agreed to continue Helen's lectures on the Chautauqua circuit in the Midwest, again arranged by the Pond Bureau. John Macy did not join them, however, since he and Sullivan were separated at the time.¹⁰³ While Helen continued her lectures that year, the war in Europe became more serious. After the sinking of the Luisitania on May 7, 1915,¹⁰⁴ the United States public came to gradually support World War I, and President Wilson introduced his preparedness program. Helen, like most American Socialists, opposed both the war and the preparedness program.¹⁰⁵

On December 19, 1915, Helen made the first of many anti-preparedness speeches.¹⁰⁶ The speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," was given at Washington Irving High School in New York City.¹⁰⁷ As reported in the New York Times, over two thousand persons came to hear Helen attack President Wilson's preparedness plan. The audience overwhelmingly approved of her speech, and Helen had to be escorted to her car by police protecting her from the excited crowd.¹⁰⁸

According to Lash, Helen was well-received by Socialists after her speech, especially in New York City. On request of the Labor Forum and the Women's Peace Party,¹⁰⁹ an organization interested in preserving world peace,¹¹⁰ Helen agreed to give another speech in New York. Many had been turned away from the first speech, so the next one was similar in content to the first.¹¹¹ This speech, "Strike Against War," was given January 5, 1916 at Carnegie Hall.¹¹²

According to Giffin, during the summer of 1916, Sullivan and Helen went on an anti-preparedness tour in the Midwest.¹¹³ As reported in her autobiography, Midstream: My Later Life, on this tour Helen usually spoke to her audiences in large halls or at a camp by a lake. Helen was not pleased with the tour, however, and concluded that it had not been successful, because she

felt that her listeners were not as enthused about the subject of war and peace.¹¹⁴ She also continued to be distressed with the negative reports she received from the press about her Socialist activities and her other views on political issues. Keller said in her autobiography, that she believed the press was only content with her when she talked about the blind and the deaf, and that the press believed she was being taken advantage of by Socialists when she spoke on anti-preparedness.¹¹⁵ When Sullivan and Helen returned home after the summer tour, they were ready for a rest. Both were tired and Sullivan was concerned with the possibility that she may be getting consumption.¹¹⁶

The next year brought new obstacles to American Socialists. As Giffin reported, in 1917, Helen became concerned about the new Espionage Act (June 15, 1917), and its effects on Socialists. She sent letters of support to those who had been strongly opposed to the war, like Socialist leader, Eugene Debs¹¹⁷ and anarchist, Emma Goldman who had been imprisoned under the Espionage Act.¹¹⁸

In January 1918, Helen delivered a speech at the New York City Civic Club, "What is the IWW?," defending the IWW and its activities.¹¹⁹ One month later, Helen and Sullivan agreed to go to Hollywood to work on a film about Helen's life. According to Lash, Helen was still deeply

admired by the public and those who had opposed her Socialist activities were ignored.¹²⁰

Less than a decade after Keller became a Socialist, she had delivered a volume of lectures, many in support of the Socialist Party and its actions. For awhile, anyway, Helen Keller, as Socialist, was seen in a new light by many of her followers.

Diminishing Role in Socialist Rhetoric

Keller's diminishing role in her Socialist rhetoric may have begun as early as 1916, after that year's tour. Then followed the long illness of her companion, Anne Sullivan.

The anti-preparedness tour Sullivan and Keller took part in in 1916, was in many ways a disappointment to Keller. Her messages about the war and her efforts to arouse her audience to oppose World War I were not received with much enthusiasm. Her audiences preferred to hear her speak on happier and more optimistic subjects than the war.¹²¹ According to Keller, to complicate matters, after the 1916 tour was completed, Sullivan became ill with pleurisy and a severe cough. In hopes of a fast recovery,¹²² Sullivan traveled to Lake Placid in New York. Later she went on to Puerto Rico, where she remained until the fall of 1917. She then returned to Wrentham. The recovery was still not complete in 1917, and Sullivan was unable to

return to the lecture circuit until a year later.¹²³

According to Lash, while Sullivan was in Puerto Rico, the popularity of the lecture circuit was declining, and the demand for lectures decreased.¹²⁴ While Sullivan was in Puerto Rico, Helen went to stay with her family in Montgomery, Alabama.¹²⁵ Helen and Sullivan relocated after Sullivan's return in 1917, and bought a new home in Forest Hills, a suburb of New York City.¹²⁶

According to Keller, in her autobiography, Midstream: My Later Life, Helen was offered the opportunity to go to Hollywood to make a film about her life, "Deliverance."¹²⁷ In February of 1918, Sullivan and Helen began negotiations on the film and spent the next few months on this project, until its completion in 1919. Sullivan's health had improved by then, and Helen seemed to need to be involved in a new project.¹²⁸ According to Keller, after the film was completed, Sullivan and Helen returned to their home in Forest Hills and lived there "quietly" for the next two years.¹²⁹

Helen Keller's Socialist rhetorical activity began to slowly decline in 1916, with the disappointing response she received from her audiences during her anti-preparedness tour that year. The decline in the popularity of the lecture circuit also added to a decrease in Keller's Socialist speaking activities. The decision to work on the

film, "Delierance," and the move into vaudeville in 1920, with the promise of more money, ended Keller's speaking activities for the Socialist Party of America.

Although Helen did shift her energies, she still remained a devout Socialist her entire life. According to Lash, Helen "remained loyal to her Socialist convictions . . ." Yet, it was Helen's own view of herself after the completion of the film, that changed her role in life, and her ". . . picture of herself as a latter-day Joan of Arc leading the workers in their emancipation struggle faded."¹³⁰

ENDNOTES

¹Helen Keller, The Story of My Life (New York: Doubleday, Pageans Company, 1903), p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 4.

³Ibid., p. 6.

⁴Ibid., p. 7.

⁵Van Wyck Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1956), p. 7.

⁶Keller, The Story of My Life, p. 7.

⁷Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, p. 10.

⁸Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁹Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁰Keller, The Story of My Life, p. 6.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 34-42.

¹²Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, p. 21.

¹³Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁴Keller, The Story of My Life, p. 364.

¹⁵Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, p. 23.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 33-34.

¹⁷Joseph P. Lash, Helen and Teacher (New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1980), p. 209.

¹⁸Keller, The Story of My Life, p. 96.

¹⁹Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, p. 40.

²⁰Ibid., p. 46.

²¹Ibid., pp. 47-48.

- ²²Ibid., pp. 53-56.
- ²³Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 366.
- ²⁴Ibid., pp. 398-401.
- ²⁵Ibid., p. 416.
- ²⁶Ibid., pp. 470-486.
- ²⁷Ibid., p. 486.
- ²⁸Ibid., pp. 488-489.
- ²⁹Ibid., p. 501.
- ³⁰Ibid., pp. 524-525.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 554.
- ³²Ibid., pp. 560-567.
- ³³Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait, pp. 103-111.
- ³⁴Ibid., pp. 117-119.
- ³⁵Ibid., pp. 144-152.
- ³⁶Lash, Helen and Teacher, pp. 765, 771-772.
- ³⁷Frederick C. Giffin, ed., Woman as Revolutionary (New York: A Mentor Book, 1973), p. 118.
- ³⁸David A. Shannon, The Socialist Party of America (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1955), pp. 1-4.
- ³⁹Ibid., p. 2.
- ⁴⁰Patrick Renshaw, The Wobblies (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967), p. 50.
- ⁴¹Ibid., p. 49.
- ⁴²Ronald Radosh, ed., Debs (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 2.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 3.

- ⁴⁴Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, pp. 10-11.
- ⁴⁵Renshaw, The Wobblies, pp. 21, 67.
- ⁴⁶Lyman Tower Sargent, Contemporary Political Ideologies (Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1978), pp. 146-147.
- ⁴⁷Renshaw, The Wobblies, p. 113.
- ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 114.
- ⁴⁹New York Times, September 9, 1909, p. 5.
- ⁵⁰Renshaw, The Wobblies, p. 114.
- ⁵¹Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 18.
- ⁵²Ibid., p. 23.
- ⁵³Ibid., p. 69.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 26, 28.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 26-27.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 37-39.
- ⁵⁷New York Times, January 13, 1912, p. 7.
- ⁵⁸Renshaw, The Wobblies, p. 135.
- ⁵⁹Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 385.
- ⁶⁰New York Times, March 19, 1912, p. 7.
- ⁶¹Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 385.
- ⁶²Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 72.
- ⁶³Radosh, Debs, p. 37.
- ⁶⁴Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 71.
- ⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 77-78.
- ⁶⁶Ibid., p. 79.
- ⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 84-85.

- ⁶⁸New York Times, April 21, 1914, p. 4.
- ⁶⁹Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, pp. 88-89, 92.
- ⁷⁰Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁷¹Ibid., pp. 28, 102-103.
- ⁷²New York Times, July 1, 1917, p. 12.
- ⁷³New York Times, June 2, 1917, p. 1.
- ⁷⁴New York Times, July 1, 1917, p. 7.
- ⁷⁵New York Times, July 13, 1917, p. 1.
- ⁷⁶Ibid., p. 3.
- ⁷⁷New York Times, August 2, 1917, p. 20.
- ⁷⁸Radosh, Debs, p. 9.
- ⁷⁹Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 118.
- ⁸⁰New York Times, June 30, 1918, p. 10.
- ⁸¹Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 121.
- ⁸²Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch For a Portrait, p. 43.
- ⁸³Helen Keller, Midstream: My Later Life (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 76.
- ⁸⁴Ibid., p. 79.
- ⁸⁵Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch For a Portrait, pp. 49, 87.
- ⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 45-46.
- ⁸⁷Ibid., p. 47.
- ⁸⁸Ibid., p. 48.
- ⁸⁹Ibid., p. 49.
- ⁹⁰Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 366.

⁹¹Ibid., pp. 369-373.

⁹²Philip S. Foner, ed., Helen Keller Her Socialist Years (New York: International Publishers Co., Inc., 1967), p. 29.

⁹³Brooks, Helen Keller Sketch For a Portrait, p. 87.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 89.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 90.

⁹⁶Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 386.

⁹⁷Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, pp. 88-89,
96-99.

⁹⁸Foner, Helen Keller Her Socialist Years, p. 52.

⁹⁹Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, pp. 155-157.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 139-141.

¹⁰¹Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 414.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 415.

¹⁰³Ibid., pp. 416-417, 421.

¹⁰⁴New York Times, May 8, 1915, p. 1.

¹⁰⁵Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 422.

¹⁰⁶Giffin, Woman as Revolutionary, p. 120.

¹⁰⁷Foner, Helen Keller Her Socialist Years, p. 73.

¹⁰⁸New York Times, December 20, 1915, p. 3.

¹⁰⁹Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 424.

¹¹⁰Shannon, The Socialist Party of America, p. 87.

¹¹¹Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 424.

¹¹²Foner, Helen Keller Her Socialist Years, p. 75.

¹¹³Giffin, Woman as Revolutionary, p. 123.

¹¹⁴Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, pp. 171-172.

- ¹¹⁵Ibid., pp. 172-173.
- ¹¹⁶Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 43.
- ¹¹⁷Giffin, Woman as Revolutionary, p. 124.
- ¹¹⁸Emma Goldman, Living My Life (New York: Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., 1931), pp. 648-650.
- ¹¹⁹Foner, Helen Keller Her Socialist Years, p. 91.
- ¹²⁰Lash, Helen and Teacher, pp. 468-471.
- ¹²¹Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, p. 176.
- ¹²²Ibid., p. 177.
- ¹²³Ibid., p. 182.
- ¹²⁴Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 470.
- ¹²⁵Ibid., p. 452.
- ¹²⁶Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, p. 186.
- ¹²⁷Ibid., p. 187.
- ¹²⁸Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 471.
- ¹²⁹Keller, Midstream: My Later Life, p. 209.
- ¹³⁰Lash, Helen and Teacher, p. 486.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

Chapter three of this study represents a rhetorical analysis of three speeches delivered from 1913 to 1918 by Keller on behalf of the Socialist movement. The three speeches, randomly chosen, were "A New Light is Coming," "Menace of the Militarist Program," and "What is the IWW?". Background of each speech was briefly reviewed and the rhetorical analysis of each speech follows. Copies of the three speeches appear in the appendix.

Textural Authenticity

The texts of the two speeches, "A New Light is Coming" and "Menace of the Militarist Program" were obtained on October 27, 1982 on microfilm from the Library of Congress. The speech, "A New Light is Coming," was found in the New York Call, July 8, 1913. The speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," was taken from the New York Call, December 20, 1915, and was also recorded in the book, Woman as Revolutionary.¹ The third speech, "What is the IWW?" was obtained from Philip S. Foner's book, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years. Foner's text indicated that the speech had been reported in the New York Call, February 3, 1918,² yet, when the speech was sought in the Call, it was not found.

Since the texts of the speeches were obtained from newspaper reports, it is doubtful that they are the exact words of Helen Keller, since the speeches may have been edited before the publication. Nevertheless, the texts should be sufficiently accurate for analysis with the possible exception of certain elements of style.

Historical Background of Speeches

"A New Light is Coming"

As reported in the New York Call, Helen Keller delivered her speech, "A New Light is Coming" at the Sociological Conference at Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts. The text of Helen's speech was recorded in the Socialist daily, the New York Call on July 8, 1913.³ As mentioned earlier in this study, during this period, the American Socialist Party was gaining strength in the United States. This was also the time of strikes in many of this country's factories. The famous textile strike in Lawrence, Massachusetts, had ended over a year earlier, on March 18, 1912, and the violent strike at Little Falls, New York, had ended on January 2, 1913, just months before this speech. Little information could be found on the surroundings relating to Keller's address. The New York Call did mention that , "Keller was one of the speakers, together with George W. Perkins and Arturo Giovannitti." The only

other information found about the program was that the auditorium may have been relatively large, since the Call reported that Keller could be heard in "all parts of the hall."⁴ Nothing further was found on the size of the auditorium, or the size of the audience.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

The New York Call reported that Helen delivered this speech at the Labor Forum, Washington Irving High School in New York City on December 19, 1915. Prior to Helen's speech, Anne Sullivan briefly introduced Helen, with an explanation of how she had taught Helen to become aware of her surroundings.⁵

As previously mentioned in this thesis, Helen's speech was delivered during the time when President Wilson's preparedness program was being discussed, prior to the United States' involvement in World War I.

The Call reported that Helen spoke to an audience of "workers," who were "crowded to the last available seat" in the high school. The Call also reported that "several hundred persons had to be turned away for lack of room long before the meeting opened."⁶ According to the book, Woman as Revolutionary, the estimate of the number in the audience was almost two thousand people.⁷

"What is the IWW?"

According to Foner, Helen Keller delivered the speech "What is the IWW?", at the New York City Civic Club in January 1918.⁸ As stated earlier in this thesis, the IWW was the Industrial Workers of the World, the more militant organization in the Socialist movement. The IWW had been founded in 1905, and was working to establish one large union for all wage earners. Months before this speech, Frank Little, an IWW strike organizer, had been lynched, which was followed by the arrests of many other IWW strike leaders and members in the United States. According to Foner, the speech was reported in the New York Call on February 3, 1918.⁹ Little else was found about the speech in regard to the audience size, the auditorium and Civic Club's program that day.

Basis of the Criteria for the
Rhetorical Analysis

The basis of the criteria used for the rhetorical analysis was Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird and Waldo W. Braden's Speech Criticism. Suitable standards of judgment were found in Part V of this text. The following evaluation is divided into four canons of speech: invention, arrangement, style, and delivery.

Invention

Invention is concerned with the context of the speech. According to Speech Criticism, "the concept of invention includes the entire investigative undertaking, the idea of the 'status,' and the modes of persuasion--logical, emotional, and ethical."¹⁰ An effort was made in this study to determine how effectively Keller satisfied each chosen criteria.

Logical Proof

Logical proof consists of evidence and reasoning intended to establish that the ideas are logically acceptable. Thonssen, Baird and Braden state that the objective of the critic should be:

. . . to determine how fully a given speech enforces an idea; how easily that enforcement conforms to the development; and how nearly the totality of the reasoning approaches a measure of truth adequate for purposes of action.¹¹

They continue by explaining the principle means of critically analyzing logical proof. The three principle means are the:

1. determination of the intellectual resources of the speaker,
2. determination of the severity and strictness of the argumentative development, and
3. determination of the "truth" of the idea in functional existence.¹²

It was necessary in this study to identify the purpose or goal in each of Keller's three speeches. It

was also necessary to determine how effectively she developed the reasoning to achieve the purpose of each speech.

Inductive Process

Inductive reasoning involves reasoning from the specific items of evidence to a generalization. It includes all the evidence that is brought to a speech by the speaker, as well as premises found from the evidence.¹³ In Speech Criticism, evidence was described as "the raw material to establish proof." Evidence includes

. . . testimony of individuals, personal experiences, tables of statistics, illustrative examples, or any so-called "factual" items which induce in the mind of the hearer or reader a state of belief--a tendency to affirm the existence of the fact or proposition to which the evidence attaches and in support of which it is introduced.¹⁴

Deductive Process

Deductive reasoning involves reasoning from accepted premises to a specific conclusion.¹⁵ Syllogism is used in the deductive process and involves reasoning by forming a major premise and a minor premise, and then a conclusion.¹⁶ Using these criteria for acceptable logical proof, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. What was the purpose in each of Keller's three speeches,

2. What lines of reasoning did she utilize in efforts to achieve this purpose, and

3. How effectively did she utilize logical proof in developing the chosen arguments?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first address the thesis was not immediately clear since it did not appear in one concise statement. After reading the speech, however, it seemed that the thesis was two-fold; first, she apparently was trying to justify herself as a credible authority with a right to speak at the conference. And second, she seems to have been trying to provide an inspirational message to her listeners, that their quality of life would soon be improved.

It appears that Keller had two main points in her address; the first which concentrated on development of her credibility, and the second seemed to be centered around her words of inspiration to her listeners.

She began her first point by admitting that she realized there were those in the audience who questioned Keller's capabilities and knowledge on the subject since she was blind and deaf. Yet, she emphasized that this fact was not a stumbling block for her since her neighbors discussed the issues of the day, and included her in these discussions. Besides this, Keller listed a number of noted "thinkers"

had kept up with the issues of the day through discussions with her friends. She appears to have relied on her intellectual resources to develop this point, by utilizing her knowledge and personal experience. This may have been quite effective, since some listeners may have had a pre-conceived image of her as a "shell" with ability to do little more than cite a few words or care for her physical needs. Keller's evidence was most likely sufficient for Keller's purpose. She probably did appear as a credible speaker after these words.

Keller's second main point seems to have been an attempt at inspiring her listeners. She apparently did this by using words of encouragement to show them that their quality of life was improving. She began simply by pointing out how pleased she was to see such a responsive audience, whose "eyes [were] open to the questions of the day." She went on by explaining how they were all marching toward a new freedom. Next, she explained that "we" do not live in a democracy because:

A democracy would mean equal opportunity for all. It would mean that every child had a chance to be well born, well fed, well taught and properly started in life: It would mean that every woman had a voice in the making of the laws under which she lives. It would mean that all men enjoyed the fruits of their labor. Such a democracy has never existed.

Following this, Keller assured her audience that there was still hope, because "we" were realizing what was right and

wrong about this world and thus, "we" would make the necessary changes to improve society. She concluded her point with a promise that "a new light is coming," the audience being a part of this light. With this in mind, Keller urged her listeners to "break every chain," which would have the following results:

Then, indeed, shall we know a better and nobler humanity. For there will be no more slaves. Men will not go on strike for 50 cents more a week. Little children will not have to starve or work in mill and factory. Motherhood will no longer be a sorrow. We shall be "just one great family of friends and brothers."

Keller appeared to have developed this point in the absence of logical proof. She did not offer evidence which might have led to the conclusion that life would improve. Neither did she discuss any specific gains, like improved laws, or higher wages which might have led to the conclusion that living conditions really would improve. Keller provided little evidence for her to conclude that the quality of life was improving, except for the mention that the audience appeared to be responsive to the changes taking place.

It appears that Keller did utilize logical proof in her first main point, primarily by using intellectual resources, but logical proof appears to have been absent in developing her second main point. She did not offer specific evidence to conclude that life would be improved.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

Keller's second address seems to have been primarily concerned with trying to persuade her listeners to oppose the preparedness program. Again there was not a thesis provided in one clear statement. It was somewhat difficult to determine for certain how many main points there were, but it seems that there were only two. The first main point was concerned with explaining why the "capitalists" wanted a war, and what they might gain from it. The second main point was less apparent, but basically it seems to have been concentrated on why the audience should oppose the preparedness program.

Keller's first main point was relatively brief, and Keller spent little time developing it. First, she explained that the capitalists stake in a war was simply for "gain." She claimed that in a war, ". . . the sanctity of a home, and even of private property is destroyed." After this, Keller offered what she referred to as "historical proof" of this "crazed need for gain," as follows:

In spite of the historical proof of the futility of war, the United States is preparing to raise a billion dollars and a million soldiers in preparation for war. Behind the active agitators for defense you will find J. P. Morgan and Co., and the capitalists who have invested their money in shrapnel plants, and others that turn out implements of murder.

Keller's first main point primarily relied on the above-mentioned evidence. However, she did not cite the source of this information, and thus, it was either common knowledge this was true, or it was Keller's personal knowledge. Nevertheless, it seems to have been inadequate support. This isolated incident would not have led to the conclusion that all capitalists supported a war, and would all gain from it, if that was Keller's intention.

Keller's second main point appeared to have been an effort to point out why the audience should be opposed to a preparedness plan. Keller began by explaining that she saw the world as her "fatherland," and thus, war involved fighting with one's family. Next, Keller diverged a bit by pointing out that the United States should prepare for peace and not war. Yet, her statements were somewhat confusing; they are as follows:

To prepare this nation in the true sense of the word, not for war, but for peace and happiness, the State should govern every department of industry, health and education in such a way as to maintain the bodies and minds of the people in soundness and efficiency. Then, the nation will be prepared to withstand the demand to fight for a perpetuation of its own slavery at the bidding of a tyrant.

Keller then discussed that it was the workers who suffered most from a war. She also stated that no enemy could treat the workers worse than their "fellow citizens of the capitalist world," and because of this, then nothing would

be lost "if the program was not supported," except as Keller put it, one's "chains."

It seems again that Keller developed this point in the absence of logical proof. She did not provide any evidence to support the claim that opposition to the preparedness plan would be specifically the wisest choice for the workers. Neither did she adequately support her claims that an enemy would not treat the workers any worse than their present system treated them.

In developing her main points in these speeches, Keller provided little, if any, research or intellectual resources to warrant the conclusions that the capitalists supported a war, or that it would be best for the workers to oppose the preparedness program.

"What is the IWW?"

Keller's final speech appears to have been an attempt to explain to the audience who the IWW was, and to explain how the existence of their organization was important to society. Again, it appears that there was no thesis provided in this address. There appear to have been three main points in this speech. The first main point provided general information about the organization, including its origins and principles. The second main point seems to have been an effort to justify some of the IWW's activities. The third main point seemed to

concentrate on why the IWW was a significant organization, important to society.

Keller's first main point included some background information concerning the IWW. Keller began by explaining that the IWW was a labor union which only admitted wage-earners, and "acts [acted] on the principle of industrial unionism." She did not document this claim. Next, she provided a brief listing of some strike activities with which the IWW had been involved, again, not documenting her information. Then Keller explained that the IWW was a unique union, and discussed the IWW's basic principles. She concluded by stating that it had been because of these principles that IWW members had been, "persecuted, beaten, imprisoned, murdered."

It does not seem that Keller adequately utilized logical proof in her main point because of the absence of documentation. She did not explain how she knew all this information was factual, neither by documenting a source, nor by using her intellectual resources. In her final statements, it would be difficult to conclude using logical proof, that the IWW members had been mistreated because of their principles without further evidence to support these claims.

In Keller's second main point it appears that she was trying to explain why she believed the IWW had received unfair publicity. She began by admitting that some people

believed the IWW to be "'foreigners,' 'the scum of the earth,' 'dangerous.'" She then went on to try to explain why these beliefs had been distorted, by claiming that the IWW were "foreigners" since many of the unskilled laborers in the United States were foreign. She also explained that they had not had "a fair chance" in America, and if they were "dangerous" it was because "they have endured countless wrongs and injuries."

Keller continued by providing an undocumented listing of a number of atrocities that had apparently occurred to IWW members, which included the "lynching of Frank Little," the "floggings" in Tulsa, the deportation of miners in Bisbee, the deaths in Ludlow, Colorado, and the massacre in Trinidad. Keller closed this point by adding that the belief the public might have, that the IWW was "organized to hinder industry" was also a misconception, and that the IWW had actually been formed "to keep industries going."

Keller made some effort in this point to utilize logical proof. The examples of atrocities committed against IWW members may have been an effective appeal, yet, it was undocumented. Also, Keller was not specific as to when these events occurred in relation to the name-calling. For example, had these accusations of IWW members come before these incidents or after? Also, her last claim,

that the IWW was formed to keep industries going, was not adequately supported. She did not use documented evidence, nor refer to specific reasons why she thought this to have been true, except for her statement that, "By organizing industrially they are forming the structure of the new society in this shell of the old." Keller did not appear to have utilized logical proof as effectively as she might have done in her second point, because of the absence of documentation and the need for more support for all her claims.

Keller's final point appeared to have been an attempt to explain why the IWW was an important organization to society. Keller began by explaining that the war would end someday, and then, "Capitalism will inevitably find itself face to face with a starving multitude of unemployed workers demanding food or destruction of the social order that has starved them and robbed them of their jobs." When this occurred, Keller maintained that, "the capitalist class cannot save itself or its institutions." When that day arrived, Keller claimed that the workers must be organized, and only the workers could save what was "good and beneficent in our civilization." She also stated that then it would be the IWW who would replace capitalism and the IWW's spirit must "animate the labor movement if it is to have a revolutionary function."

Keller's final main point appears to have been absent of logical proof. She did not provide any evidence to support why she believed that after a war there would be mass unemployment and starving people. Neither did she provide any documented evidence which led her to conclude why capitalism would cease, nor did she explain with evidence why it was that she believed the IWW and the workers would be capable of "carrying on the business of the world" after capitalism ceased. Keller did not utilize logical proof effectively in her final main point.

Keller made little attempt at effectively utilizing logical proof in her final speech. She made some effort at offering evidence through examples, but failed to document these supports.

Composite Analysis of Logical Proof

It appears that, in general, Keller did not fully utilize logical proof in her speeches. In her first speech, it appears that only one of the two points did include logical proof. Keller did not effectively utilize logical proof in her second speech, and she did make a meager attempt in her final speech at utilizing evidence, yet, it was limited and undocumented.

Ethical Proof

According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, ethical proof may be defined as:

the instrument of proof is the moral character when the delivery of the speech is such as to produce an impression of the speaker's credibility; for we yield a more complete and ready credence to persons of high character not only ordinarily and in a general way, but in such matters as do not admit of absolute certainty but necessarily have room for differences of opinion, without any qualification whatever.¹⁷

For purposes of this study, ethical proof was divided into character, the sagacity and the good will of the speaker.

Perceived Character

The perceived character of a speaker is how she attempts to make herself appear "virtuous." The speaker may do this by concentrating on the following:

1. associates [associating] either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated;
2. bestows [bestowing], with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause;
3. links [linking] the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous;
4. removes [removing] or minimizes [minimizing] unfavorable impressions of himself or his causes previously established by his opponent;
5. relies [relying] upon authority derived from his personal experience; and
6. creates [creating] the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking.¹⁸

To evaluate the effectiveness of Keller in establishing her character, the following question was asked:

How effectively were the character resources utilized by Keller in her speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, "A New Light is Coming," she made a number of attempts to appear sincere and to establish her character. The first attempt was made in her opening statement. She introduced her speech by saying:

Dear Friends: I came here to listen, not to talk. I have not prepared a speech. But I suppose a woman can always think of something to say. If other subjects fail, one can talk about oneself.

In this statement, it seems that Keller was sincere with the audience, by admitting that she had not come prepared to give a speech. She did not try to mislead the audience into thinking that this speech had been prepared, and wanted the audience to realize that immediately. She appears to have effectively conveyed that impression through this passage.

Keller may have been attempting to remove any doubt that her audience may have had about her being blind and deaf, which is apparent in the following statement: "Well, I plead guilty to the charge that I am deaf and blind, though I forget the fact most of the time."

By this statement, Keller appears to have been honest and sincere about her blindness and deafness, and it should have left no doubt in anyone's mind that she was

blind and deaf and that concern could now be set aside in favor of important considerations. It also gave some indication to the audience how she felt about her disabilities. This is especially apparent in her words, ". . . though I forget the fact most of the time."

Next, Keller seems to have been attempting to point out that she was speaking that day on "authority" obtained from her personal experiences. She did this by elaborating on her knowledge of current issues. She emphasized her literary background by listing the authors she had read, including H. G. Wells, Charles Darwin and Karl Marx. She also stressed she had read a number of magazines from numerous countries and also mentioned the conversations she often had with her friends on current issues. It was apparent that she was well-informed on the issues. With this knowledge, she had come to realize that the workers had been mistreated in the United States. Through these statements, she made both herself and her cause appear to be virtuous. In the following passage Keller summarized her right to discuss current issues, just as anyone else had that right.

At all events, I claim my right to discuss them.
I have the advantage of a mind trained to think,
and that is the difference between myself and
most people, not my blindness and sight.

Keller did appear to have the authority to speak at the conference because of her personal experience, and

her lengthy explanations demonstrated that she was aware of the current issues and how they affected the workers.

In the next passage, Keller may have been trying to make the workers seem virtuous, while at the same time she attacked the "opponent."

It seems to me that they are blind indeed who do not see that there must be something very wrong when the workers--the men and women who produce the wealth of the nation--are ill paid, ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed. Deaf indeed are they who do not hear the desperation in the voice of the people crying out against cruel poverty and social injustice.

Keller appeared to have been effective in her attempt to make herself virtuous, while minimizing the virtue of her opponent. In this last statement it is apparent that the "opponent"--"they who do not hear the desperation in the voice of the people"--is not virtuous since they are "deaf" to these cries of the worker. Yet, Keller's "cause," the workers, do appear virtuous by claiming that the workers, "who produce the wealth of the nation," only receive poverty in return for their service.

Finally, as demonstrated in the next statement, Keller may have been attempting to elicit the impression that she was completely sincere in her undertaking. The passage follows: "I have been much interested in what I have heard here. I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the questions of the day." In this, Keller seems to be sincere by her admission that she was interested in

the happenings at the conference. The statement appears to be an attempt at re-emphasizing or underscoring her sincerity in her message. Keller was probably quite effective in her first speech in building her personal ethos, and conveying the impression of sincerity.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In Keller's second speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," Keller seemed less concerned with building her personal ethos than she did in her first speech. In about the middle of Keller's speech, she apparently was attempting to appear sincere when she pointed out what a war meant to her personally.

In the following passage, concerning the threat of a war, she stated: "I look upon the world as my fatherland, and every war has to me a horror of a family feud. I look upon true patriotism as the brotherhood of man and the service of all to all."

With this statement, Keller may have been trying to convey the impression of sincerity in her message. She apparently was sincere about her opposition to a war, and at the same time she linked her opponent's cause with that which was not virtuous. This was especially evident in her words, "war has to me a horror of a family feud."

As mentioned earlier, Keller did not spend much time building her personal ethos in this speech, and this

appears to have been her only attempt. This may be because by the time this speech was given, 1915, Keller was a well-known personality in not only the United States, but throughout the world, as well. For these reasons, she may have found it unnecessary to spend much time convincing the audience of her credibility.

"What is the IWW?"

In Keller's final speech, "What is the IWW?", she spent some time establishing her character, but again, it was not extensive. In her opening remarks she appeared to be sincere about her cause because she pointed out that she felt it was necessary to discuss who the IWW was, and she was going to be the one who would attempt to do this. In her opening remarks she stated:

I am going to talk about the IWW because they are so much in the public eye right now. They are probably the most hated and most loved organization in existence. Certainly they are the least understood and the most persistently misrepresented.

In this statement, not only did Keller seem to be sincere in what she planned to talk about, but she may have also been perceived as honest by pointing out that the IWW was not an organization respected by everyone. Then in the final statement in this passage, she may have been trying to minimize any preconceived negative beliefs about the IWW in stating that they had been the "least understood and the most persistently misrepresented." Later in her

speech, Keller seemed to be more concerned with creating a favorable impression of her cause, the IWW, than she was with building her own ethos. In one instance, she offered the following explanation as to why the IWW had been referred to as the, "scum of the earth": "I know they never had a fair chance. They have been starved in body and mind, . . .". By Keller declaring that she knew that the IWW had never "had a fair chance," she may have been attempting to minimize the unfavorable impressions that some may have had concerning the IWW.

Later, Keller again gave a personal affirmation to the IWW by emphasizing how deeply she cared about them. In the following statement she said: "I love them for their needs, their miseries, their endurance and their daring spirit." In this statement, she could have been trying to build up her cause, the IWW, by using herself as an "authority."

The composite analysis of perceived character. In each of Keller's speeches she seems to have been attempting to convey the impression that she was sincere in her messages. It was apparent that Keller spent a considerable amount of time in her first speech building her personal ethos, and it appears to be that she was effective in her attempt. She associated herself with her cause and with

her supporting remarks of her personal experiences she did appear sincere and virtuous.

It should be noted again, that in 1913, although Keller was a well-known personality throughout the world, she had not been a socialist for very long. She became a socialist in 1909, and her socialist convictions did not become public until approximately two years later, in 1911. Keller may have felt she needed more time to build her personal ethos at this point in her career. This point is further justified, since by the time Keller delivered the next speech in the study, in 1915, she did not spend much time building her personal ethos, except for declaring that she was opposed to war. In Keller's final speech, this point can be further observed in that although Keller did spend some time establishing character, it was primarily centered around establishing her cause's virtues, the IWW, rather than her own.

Perceived Sagacity

Sagacity refers to the perceived knowledge of the speaker which makes the speaker more believable to the audience. The speaker may establish it through the following ways:

1. uses [using] what is popularly called common sense;
2. acts [acting] with tact and moderation;

3. displays [displaying] a sense of good taste;
4. reveals [revealing] a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and
5. shows [showing] through the way in which he handles speech material that he is¹⁹ possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.

In order to determine Keller's effectiveness in establishing her sagacity or knowledge, the following question was asked: How effectively did Keller utilize her perceived sagacity as ethical proof?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, "A New Light is Coming," she presented several examples of her own knowledge. She began by admitting that she knew many people had been wondering what she knew about the subjects being discussed at the conference. She accredited this doubting to the fact that she was blind and deaf. She then went on to give a number of reasons as to why this had little bearing on her knowledge of the issues discussed at the conference. First, she pointed out that although she did not hear the discussions about current events, she did receive these messages, because they were repeated to her through sign language, and she did not miss much through this process. Keller gave additional evidence that she was knowledgeable, by noting a number of writers whose views she had studied. Thus, it would seem apparent that Keller was familiar with the issues of the day and was well-read.

Keller continued by referring to current events. She admitted she was not always "on the spot when things happen," but emphasized that neither were most people. With this statement, she seemed to establish her knowledge by pointing out that she was familiar with what was occurring in the world. She appeared to be quite effective at conveying this impression to her audience.

Then Keller again stressed the point that being deaf and blind did not mean that she could not think. In the following passage it seems that she made that point quite clear:

But I have studied these professions, and I think I understand their relation to society. At all events, I claim my right to discuss them. I have the advantage of a mind trained to think, and that is the difference between myself and most people, not my blindness and their sight.

In these words Keller tactfully explained that her blindness did not hinder her life style. She appeared to be effective in conveying this image to the audience. In all, nearly half of Keller's speech was devoted to explanations concerning her familiarities with the issues of the day. She also demonstrated that she was knowledgeable concerning the subjects at the conference, as well as being aware of her listeners' misconceptions that might have existed because she was blind and deaf.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In Keller's second speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," she did not overtly spend much time establishing her knowledge as personal ethos. She relied heavily on personal knowledge as evidence, yet, she did not establish herself as an authority. She provided no documentation, so her audience was left to decide if she was knowledgeable on the subject being discussed. She did, however, refer to the actions of contemporary capitalists, like J. P. Morgan and Company, who she believed were supporters of the war. By this, she did demonstrate familiarity with the current issues. Yet, she did not establish herself as an authority. It was left for the audience to determine.

"What is the IWW?"

In "What is the IWW?", Keller again did not build her knowledge as personal ethos. The evidence presented in the speech was undocumented. She did not establish herself as an authority on the IWW, even though she did rely on personal knowledge as evidence. Keller presented some historical background on the IWW, such as when they originated, some of the strikes they had been involved in, and information on the IWW's principles. But, she did not attempt to establish that she was an authority on the IWW, and she did not document the strike activities, nor

cite where she had obtained information about the IWW's principles.

Later, Keller referred to some recent attacks that had been made on the IWW, like the lynching of Frank Little. Perhaps this may have been an attempt to reveal that she was familiar with the current activities. Keller continued by discussing the reasons the IWW was formed, with some predictions of what its role would be in the future. Again, her claim rested on personal knowledge.

Composite analysis of perceived sagacity. Considering the criteria established, Keller did appear to be effective in utilizing her knowledge as ethical proof in her first speech, but was not so effective in the other two speeches. In her first speech, she spent a considerable amount of time tactfully revealing that she was familiar with the issues of the day through her conversations and literary background. She appeared to be quite effective in eliciting the impression of being knowledgeable.

In the next two speeches, Keller did not make use of perceived knowledge. She did not attempt to establish herself as an authority in either speech. Nor did she document her evidence in these speeches. She made some reference in each speech to specific events, like the strike activities, which may have been an attempt to reveal that she was familiar with the current events of the day. Yet,

in both speeches it was primarily left to the audience to decide if she was knowledgeable on the subject.

Perceived Good Will

The speaker's good will refers to the speaker's conviction to her cause. Good will also refers to how truthful the speaker is to the audience, and to what extent the audience feels they can trust her. The good will of the speaker toward the audience may be established in the following ways; if the speaker:

1. capture [captures] the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience;
2. identify [identifies] himself properly with the hearers and their problems;
3. proceed [proceeds] with candor and straightforwardness;
4. offer [offers] necessary rebukes with tact and consideration;
5. offset [offsets] any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and
6. reveal [reveals] without guile or exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.

To evaluate the speaker's efforts in establishing good will, the following question was asked: How effectively did Keller communicate an attitude of trustfulness to her audience in each speaking situation?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, "A New Light is Coming," she made several references which might have enhanced "good will." She was frank with the audience by explaining to

them that she had not intended to present a speech at the conference. With this admission, she seemed to have been trying to appear straightforward and truthful with her listeners, and not misleading. She pointed out to the audience, that although she was blind and deaf, she was still informed and had the right to speak that day.

Later Keller made an identification with her audience. In the following passage she revealed how she had been positively affected by the conference: "I have been much interested in what I have heard here. I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the question of the day."

Through this passage, Keller appears to have been attempting to identify with her audience by saying that she was also interested in what had been discussed, and offered praise to those in the audience whose "eyes [were] open to the questions of the day."

Later, Keller may have enhanced her "good will" by using the word "we" to identify herself with her listeners, as in the following passage: "We are marching toward a new freedom. We are learning that freedom is the only safe condition." In her closing remarks, she continued to utilize the word "we": "We are finding out what is wrong with the world. We are going to make it right. We are learning that we live by each other." Through the use of the word "we" and later, the word "our," Keller must have

established "good will" by identifying with her listeners. She seems to have effectively given the impression that they could trust her because she was fighting with them, and they were not alone. She appeared to have effectively developed the attitude of trust by being honest and straightforward, and by identifying herself with her listeners and their problems.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In "Menace of the Militarist Program," Keller did not do much to establish her "good will" to the audience. She did appear to try to establish her "good will" by simply being straightforward about her feelings of war, as in the following passage: "I look upon the whole world as my fatherland, and every war has to me a horror of a family feud." This statement appeared to establish her "good will" because it seems to have been an honest and straightforward feeling about war. It may have been implied that her audience could trust her because she also had something to lose in a war, her "family." In this speech, of course, Keller did indirectly identify with her listeners. Although, she did not spend much time in her speech establishing her "good will," she was a socialist, and that identified her with many of her listeners.

"What is the IWW?"

In Keller's final speech, "What is the IWW?", she again did not make extensive efforts to establish her "good will." In her opening statement she said, "I am going to talk about the IWW because they are so much in the public eye just now." At least this was a straightforward statement, and her audience had some indication as to why she was speaking that day.

Keller also explained, "Let me tell you something about the IWW as I see them." She went on to say that they were comprised of unskilled workers who had suffered a variety of injustices and hardships. This attempt may have been ineffective. By pointing out to her audience that she was going to tell them how she saw the IWW, some doubts could have been raised as to whether she would be unbiased in her explanation, since Keller was a supporter of the IWW. Keller may have been ineffective with this point since her impression of the IWW was basically positive. She might not have been perceived as a "messenger of the truth."

It should be noted that Keller did not appear to have any personal reasons of gain for giving this speech, other than her respect for the IWW's efforts. This may be seen in the following passage: "I love them for their needs, their miseries, their endurance and their daring spirit." In this statement, Keller seemed to raise her

"good will" by showing that she was being truthful, and the audience could trust her since she had no personal reasons for giving this speech.

Composite analysis of good will. Regarding good will, in Keller's first speech she did spend some time establishing it. She was straightforward about her blindness and deafness, and appeared to have been effective in conveying an impression of trustfulness to her audience. She also appeared to have effectively identified with her audience in a number of ways, and so her listeners could trust her since she was fighting along with them.

In her last two speeches, she did not spend much time establishing her "good will." In the second speech she made some attempt at identifying with her listeners and developed an attitude of trust. However, she may have been most effective in establishing "good will" simply because the audience knew she was a socialist. She already identified with many of her listeners, since many of them were socialists themselves, or were sympathetic to the cause. In Keller's last speech, she did not appear to effectively establish an attitude of trustfulness. However, it is not known who was in the audience, so we cannot be certain as to the absolute effect on the audience.

Composite Analysis of Ethical Proof

Keller apparently was quite effective in establishing her perceived character in all three speeches. She did spend more time establishing her personal character in her first speech, perhaps because she was less-known as a socialist. In her final speech, she spent more time establishing her cause's character. Keller was also more effective in establishing perceived sagacity in her first speech than her last two speeches. The same was true of perceived "good will." Keller again spent more time establishing an impression of trustfulness in her first speech, than she did in her last two speeches.

Emotional Proof

Emotional proof refers to how the speaker adapts the speech to the audience. According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, ". . . emotional proof, . . . is designed to put the listener in a frame of mind to react favorably and comfortably to the speaker's purpose."²¹

Audience Adaptation

The basic consideration of emotional proof is adaptation. Adaptation refers to the ". . . adjustment to the variables of human behavior as found in a specific group of hearers."²²

In an effort to analyze the use of emotional proof in Keller's three speeches, the following questions were asked:

1. How effectively did Keller adapt to the different audience conditions in each of the speaking situations,
2. How frequently did the speeches utilize emotional proof, and
3. What forms did the emotional proof take?

"A New Light is Coming"

Although it was not established who made up the audience at the Sociological Conference the day Keller delivered her speech, it was most likely comprised of supporters of the Socialist Party or those sympathetic to their beliefs.

After Keller's opening remarks, she made a number of supportive references to "the workers." She was probably effective in adapting to her audience with these appeals, since the audience was likely to have been supporters of the working class.

Keller seems to have tried to praise the audience, as well as to identify herself with them. She appears to have effectively praised her audience by congratulating them for their understanding of the problems of the worker. She did this on a number of occasions, as in the following passage:

I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the questions of the day, and to the great change that is taking place in the structure of society.

Keller continued with this appraisal of her audience, and also identified herself with her listeners and their cause. Examples of this were as follows: "We are finding out what is wrong with the world. We are going to make it right." With statements like these, Keller may have successfully appealed to the audience by pointing out that many of them had a special insight on the issues of the day, and that both Keller and the audience had the best interests of the world in mind. Keller appears to have utilized emotional proof effectively in these instances.

In Keller's final words, she was especially emotional in her language and her message reached its dramatic climax. She stated:

With our hearts let us see, with your hands let us break every chain. Then, indeed, shall we know a better and nobler humanity. For there will be no more slaves. Men will not go on strike for 50 cents more a week. Little children will not have to starve or work in mill and factory. Motherhood will no longer be a sorrow. We shall be "just one great family of friends and brothers."

Keller was likely to have been effective in utilizing emotional proof in this last passage. She pointed out that it was left up to the listeners to change their quality of life, which was especially evident in the words ". . . let us break every chain." She seems to have

attempted to make her audience see they played an important role, and that their lives had purpose because of what was going to be accomplished.

It is apparent that Keller effectively utilized emotional proof in her speech, "A New Light is Coming." By what seem to have been attempts at using identification with, and praise of the audience, Keller effectively used emotional proof.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In Keller's next speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," she again relied heavily on emotional proof to convince her listeners not to support the preparedness program. As reported in the New York Call, December 20, 1915, she delivered her speech to an "audience of workers."²³

In her opening statements, she said it was the workers who suffered the most from a war. By such a reference, Keller was apparently trying to point out how each audience member could be adversely affected, on a personal level, if a war was supported. This was probably quite effective, since a person who has something to lose may be more receptive to a particular appeal, than if it were directed at someone else's loss.

She then continued, by attacking the capitalist system, claiming that: "it [the capitalist system] has

no morals it will not sacrifice for gain." This language and attack on the capitalists was probably quite an effective emotional appeal, since those in the audience may have also had negative feelings about the capitalist system.

Keller continued her attack on the capitalists in her speech, by portraying them as supporters of the war. In the following statement, it seems that Keller was attempting to make the capitalists appear as being pro-war: "they [the capitalists] want armaments because they beget war, for these capitalists want to develop new markets for their hideous traffic." Again, Keller seems to have adapted effectively to her audience by carefully wording her statement so as to identify with the feelings of the audience. The audience probably had negative feelings towards the capitalist system, and portraying them as being supporters of the war may have intensified already hostile feelings.

Following this, it seems that Keller attempted to appeal to her audience by identification. She apparently did this by emphasizing that she hated war, and that, "the only fighting that saves is the one that helps the world toward liberty, justice and an abundant life for all." Keller may have been trying to identify with the workers' feelings with this statement, by pointing out that what

was worth fighting for was an "abundant life," which the workers supposedly did not have.

Throughout the last half of her speech, she also referred to the worker's role in a war. She was most likely effective in adapting to the audience by taking this approach, and used a variety of ways to refer to the workers in her speech. One way was by emphasizing the workers' poor living conditions and how that related to the threat of a war. One such instance where this seemed to be effective was in the following passage:

Nothing is gained by the workers from war. They suffer all the miseries, while the rulers reap the rewards. Their wages are not increased, nor their toil made lighter, nor their homes made more comfortable.

Keller may have been hoping that the audience would see that not even the workers' living conditions would improve with their participation in the war. A war would just be like another strike that produced no benefits.

As her speech progressed, the language became even stronger. Her words seemed to promote attitudes and emotions which reinforced positive feelings towards the worker (her audience), while suggesting negative sentiment towards the capitalists and a war. This may be seen in the following passage:

No conqueror can beat down his wages more ruthlessly or oppress him more than his own fellow citizens of the capitalist world are doing. The worker has nothing to lose but his chains, and

he has a world to win. He can win it at one strike from a world empire.

Apparently Keller effectively adapted to her audience with this strong language. A person who has worked at a job that is low-paying and has poor working conditions may at some point wish to finally be rid of "his chains." This language may symbolize the desire to "escape," or to finally be independent from the demands of a dead-end job. This may have been especially true if that employee had been exploited at one time. With the promise of "winning" added to Keller's message, she may have been trying to show her listeners that their lives were not hopeless at all, but there was really quite a lot in store for the workers in the future, a victory.

In Keller's closing statements, she again utilized emotional proof, this time by asking a series of emotionally-charged questions. This seems to have been an attempt to induce her audience to examine their own living conditions and to decide what a war would really accomplish for them. She set the mood with an attack on the capitalists, as seen in the following statement: "This great republic is a mockery of freedom as long as you are doomed to dig and sweat to earn a miserable living while the masters enjoy the fruit of your toil." Her statement is laden with emotional language, especially evident in the phrases: "mockery of freedom," "doomed to dig and

sweat," and "miserable living." The series of questions followed:

What have you to fight for? National independence? That means the master's independence. The laws that send you to jail when you demand better living conditions? The flag? Does it wave over a country where you are free and have a home, or does it rather symbolize a country that meets you with clenched fists when you strike for better wages and shorter hours? Will you fight for your master's religion which teaches you to obey them even when they tell you to kill one another?

Keller concluded her speech with a final question, and a plea for the workers to unionize and to revolt. She stated:

Why don't you make a junk heap of your master's religion, his civilization, his Kings and his customs that tend to reduce a man to a brute and God to a monster? Let there go forth a clarion call for liberty. Let the workers form one great world-wide union, and let there be a globe-encircling revolt to gain for the workers true liberty and happiness.

Keller may have utilized emotional proof in this final appeal. She may have been attempting to offer her listener some hope for the future by claiming that they could change their conditions by unionizing. Perhaps then the audience could feel that not all was lost, and that they might actually play a role in changing their lives and conquering their "master." Yet, it would be difficult to determine how effective Keller was in these last statements, without further information concerning the audience. Keller's language was biting, at the least. She

could have possibly turned away some audience members with these final statements. For example, the questions referring to independence and freedom could have possibly been detrimental. Some of the listeners may have agreed that there had been many problems for the workers, but they may have also had strong positive feelings about America as a democratic country. They may have also rejected the attack on the "master's religion" since some workers probably shared their "master's religion," by their own choice. Yet, under certain conditions, depending on the school's physical environment that day, the attitude of the audience prior to the speech, and many other factors, such language could have been an excellent choice for this audience, and the audience may have been ready for Keller's strong comments. If "the workers" had reached a point of hopelessness in their lives, Keller's final words might have been received with overwhelming approval.

Keller effectively utilized emotional proof in her second speech. She seemed to have been concerned with identifying what might have been the feelings of her audience.

"What is the IWW?"

In Keller's final speech, "What is the IWW?", the only information obtained with regard to the audience was that it was delivered at the New York City Civic Club.²⁴

Considering this, the analysis of emotional proof must rest on certain assumptions since it has not been established who was in the audience. For purposes of this study, it was assumed that the civic club was made up of a number of citizens from a variety of backgrounds. They may have been supporters of Keller's cause, or they may not have been.

After her opening statements, Keller gave information on when the IWW was formed and what its principles were. Although she offered factual information such as: "It [the IWW] admits only wage-earners, and acts on the principle of industrial unionism," she also scattered bits of information that had factual basis but seemed to have been worded in a way to create emotional favorableness to the IWW. One example is the following statement:

Its battleground is the field of industry. The visible expression of the battle is the strike, the lock-out, the clash between employer and employed. It is a movement of revolt against the ignorance, the poverty, the cruelty that too many of us accept in blind content.

It appears that Keller may also have been attempting to gain support for the IWW by emphasizing that the revolt was against things which most people (the audience) usually want abolished. She may have been effective if she had ended at that point, but when she added, ". . . that too many of us accept in blind content," this might have offended some listeners.

It appears that Keller spent some time trying to create a picture of the IWW as a beaten and mistreated group, who had only been driven to rebel because of the injustices they had endured. She pointed out that they had, "never had a fair chance," and that they had been, "starved in body and mind, denied, exploited, driven like slaves from job to job." This may have been an effective appeal, since she was probably attempting to appeal to the listeners' respect for equality, and for all people to be treated fairly in their working conditions. Yet, it is not certain that all the listeners may have believed the IWW workers had been mistreated. The listeners may have had negative preconceived attitudes about the IWW which would have made this appeal less effective.

Following this, Keller appeared to have been trying to appeal to the audience's conscience. She seems to have effectively done this by first citing a number of violent actions that had happened to IWW members, like the incident of the deportation of 1200 miners from Bisbee. Then Keller asked her audience if they could blame the IWW if they did not always respect the law. Her reasoning, based on emotional proof, follows:

So the IWWs respect the law only as a soldier respects an enemy! Can you find it in your hearts to blame them? I love them for their needs, their miseries, their endurance and their daring spirit. It is because of this spirit that the master class fears and hates them. It is

because of this spirit that the poor and oppressed love them with a great love.

This may have been Keller's strongest and most effective emotive appeal. Many IWW members had been mistreated. Keller may have gained support for the IWW, since the listeners might have agreed with the IWW's justification for their often militant actions because of these atrocities. Also when Keller pointed out that she loved them for their "endurance and their daring spirit," she appears to have been attempting to appeal to the listeners' respect for such qualities, which apparently IWW members possessed. Yet, such an appeal could have been ineffective if audience members could not see violence justified under any circumstance.

In the final portion of the speech, Keller concentrated on economic interests, and the IWW's role in the economy. She asked her audience: "Now, don't you see, it is impossible to maintain an economic order that keeps wages practically at a standstill, while the cost of living mounts higher and even higher?"

In what seemed to be an attempt to identify her listeners with the subject she was discussing, Keller pointed out that the war would someday end, and then "capitalism" would discover it would have to deal with a starving, multitude of unemployed workers demanding food

or destruction of the social order that has starved them and robbed them of their jobs.

In Keller's conclusion, she pointed out that the "capitalist class" would not be able to save itself "in such a crisis." She warned that if the workers were not organized when that happened, ". . . they may easily become a blind force of destruction, unable to check their own momentum, their cry for justice drowned in a howl of rage." Keller may have attempted to identify this situation directly to her listeners. If and when capitalism failed, the audience members should also be prepared for that day. It is unclear if such an appeal would have been effective to the New York City Civic Club. It is not certain as to how many people believed that "a crisis" like Keller described was really evident.

It is not possible to make any accurate analysis of how effectively Keller utilized emotional proof, since so little is known about her audience. Some assumptions, however, have been made. It appears that Keller may have tried to be frank with her audience, and may have tried to gain support for her cause by pointing out that the IWW was striving for equality and self-preservation; those things which her listeners might also hope for in life. Her most effective appeal might have been when she mentioned the senseless acts that had been committed against IWW

members. Perhaps some people could justify the IWW's militant activities considering they had been treated so unjustly.

Composite Analysis of Emotional Proof

In all three speeches, it appears that Keller relied heavily on emotional appeals and was apparently quite effective in the use of pathos.

Arrangement

Arrangement refers to the structure of oral discourse. According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, arrangement or disposition, involves the "selection, orderly arrangement, and proportioning of the parts of an address."²⁵

When the critic evaluates the arrangement of a particular speech, two things should be considered. First, the speech should be analyzed for a basis of its construction and how the parts of the speech fit together. Second, the organization of the speech should be analyzed as to how it was adapted to its audience.²⁶

Thematic Emergence

The emergence of a central theme or proposition is referred to as the thematic emergence. The speech should contain a clearly determined statement of the purpose or thesis.²⁷

To determine the effectiveness of the thesis in each of Keller's speeches, the following question was asked: How clearly did the central theme emerge in each of the three speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

Keller began her speech with an admission to the audience that she had not prepared a speech, but would probably think of something to say anyway. Following this, Keller spent a considerable amount of time explaining why she had a right to speak at the conference, and why she had a special insight on the issues of the day, especially with the problems of the workers. Then Keller spent the rest of her time speaking about "the great change" that was occurring, and "the new light" that was coming. The central theme was not provided in one statement of purpose. It appears that the purpose of her speech was two-fold; first, it was to convince the audience that she was capable of understanding the conditions of the workers. This point was evident in statements like the one which follows:

To be sure, I have never been a captain of industry, or a soldier, or a strikebreaker. But I have studied these professions, and I think I understand their relation to society. At all events, I claim my right to discuss them.

In the second half of the speech, Keller appears to have wanted to raise the hopes of her listeners by emphasizing that their lives would be improving because of "the change" that was occurring. This was the second purpose of her speech. A statement typical of this segment of the speech follows: "I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the question of the day, and to the great change that is taking place in the structure of society."

Although Keller's purpose for speaking appears to have been two-fold, it was difficult to determine since she did not indicate the purpose or thesis in one clear statement.

"A Menace of the Militarist Program"

The purpose in the second speech appears to have been that a war would be undesirable since the workers would be those with the most to lose, and thus, the workers should oppose any attempts; like the preparedness program, which supported a war. Again, the thesis was not provided in a clearly-worded statement. In the opening, Keller did declare that "the burden of war always falls heaviest on the toilers." Yet, this statement did not encompass the entire purpose of the speech. After this, she went on to

discuss the futility of war, and explained how a war was morally wrong. Throughout the speech, she held to the basic theme that a war would be most detrimental to the workers, yet, she did not offer a clearly-stated thesis in her speech.

"What is the IWW?"

In Keller's last speech, her general purpose was to discuss the IWW. She stated in the first sentence of her speech: "I am going to talk about the IWW because they are so much in the public eye just now." Again, it was difficult to pick out a clearly-stated thesis, yet, as indicated in this sentence, she did talk about the IWW, their origins, and the unfair publicity they had received. Finally, she justified their existence as a vital organization in society.

Method of Division and Arrangement

According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, methods of organization refers to the "choice of a principle by means of which the materials of a speech are divided." They offer four methods of organizing materials. These are: historical, distributive, logical, and psychological.²⁸

"A New Light is Coming"

In the first speech, Keller used the topical method of organization. The first main point began: "Ever since

I came here, people have been asking my friends how I can have first-hand knowledge of the subjects you are discussing." She continued this point with an explanation of why she could speak with authority at the conference.

The second point in her speech was concentrated on raising the spirits of her audience by convincing them that a change in the quality of their lives was coming. In this point she discussed the new life people would have when these changes were made.

The organizational pattern of the speech was topical, which seems an appropriate choice for the speech, since she first wanted to explain her credibility as a speaker, and then discuss the improved quality of life for everyone.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In Keller's second speech, she again used the topical order of organization. In the introduction, she explained that war left the most harmful effects on the workers. Then in the rest of her speech she discussed various aspects of war especially harmful for the workers.

Under the first main point, Keller talked about the capitalists' gains from a war. She began this point by stating: "The only moral virtue of war is that it compels the capitalist system to look itself in the face and admit it is a fraud." She maintained that everything in a war

was sacrificed for this "gain." She then mentioned the "capitalist's reasons" for wanting a war.

In the second point, she talked about the proposed preparedness plan. This point was obscure, and it was difficult to determine if she was always referring to the preparedness plan, since she occasionally diverged from the point. The second main point began as follows: "I look upon the whole world as my fatherland, and every war has to be a horror of a family feud." Keller began by talking about war as being wrong, since the entire world was one family. Then Keller strayed from the point, briefly commenting that peace should be sought and not war: "... the state should govern every department of industry, health and education in such a way as to maintain the bodies and minds of the people in soundness and efficiency." Keller then went back to discussing that workers are harmed by a war, and thus, should be opposed to a preparedness program.

The speaker concluded with a series of questions, loosely summarizing what it was that the workers would be fighting for in the event of war.

The organizational pattern chosen appears to have been appropriate if Keller wanted to discuss the losses from a war and the proposed preparedness plan. Yet, it was difficult to follow her second point since it strayed from the topic of the proposed preparedness program.

"What is the IWW?"

The final speech was also topically organized. In the first main point, Keller discussed the origins of the IWW, some of their strike activities, the concept of the IWW as a union, and the IWW's principles. The first statement of this point was: "The IWW is a labor union based on the class struggle."

In the second main point, Keller claimed the IWW had received unfair publicity. She also attempted to justify the IWW's actions by introducing the point with the statement, "Let me tell you something about the IWWs as I see them."

The final main point concerned the "purpose" of the IWW, which Keller said would be realized when capitalism failed. She began: "Now, don't you see, it is impossible to maintain an economic order that keeps wages practically at a standstill, while the cost of living mounts higher and even higher?" Again the topical organizational pattern seems to have been an appropriate choice for enumerating characteristics of the IWW. The first point, however, was developed chronologically.

Composite analysis of the method
of organization

In each of Keller's speeches she used the topical method of organization, which appears to have been an appropriate choice.

Development of the Speech

Thonssen, Baird and Braden stated that the development of the speech refers to the order in which the parts are organized. The clarity of the main points of the speech is important in creating the desired response from the audience.²⁹

To evaluate the effectiveness of the body of the speech, the following question was asked: How clear were the transitions and the main points in each of Keller's three speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, it was difficult to determine the main points, probably because of the absence of transitions. It was unlikely that Keller had an outline prepared prior to presenting her speech, as she even indicated this in her introductory remarks:

Dear Friends: I came here to listen, not to talk. I have not prepared a speech. But I suppose a woman can always think of something to say. If other subjects fail, one can talk about herself.

Immediately after her introduction, she began to establish herself as an authority, with a right to speak at the conference. No thesis was offered, and no direction was indicated in her first point.

When she began her second main point, again she gave no indication of the direction she intended to go with

this point. She simply began discussing the change that was coming for the workers.

She did not summarize her points. She completed the speech with encouraging words that "a new light is coming," and a better quality of life is in store for everyone.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In the second speech, the transitions and main points were not immediately clear. Keller began by commenting that war hit hardest on the workers. No overview was offered, and a thesis did not exist in a clearly-determined statement.

In the first main point she talked about the capitalists' gains from a war. The point was not introduced, and she did not verbally indicate where her second main point began. In the second main point, she briefly covered a number of concepts centered around the concept of a preparedness program. First, she mentioned that there should not be any fighting. She then moved on to say that the people should be prepared to withstand what she referred to as "the demand to fight for a perpetuation of its own slavery at the bidding of a tyrant." She finished by going back to say that nothing would be gained from a war for the workers.

Keller summarized her main points, in a way, by asking a series of questions. It was a loose review of what the workers would lose from a war. The final remarks were, like in her first speech, words of encouragement and action directed to the listener.

"What is the IWW?"

Keller discussed the IWW in her final speech, but again the thesis was not presented in one sentence. In the introduction she provided some indication of the direction her speech would take, saying that she was going to be discussing the IWW. Yet, this was not specific.

Her first point provided basic information about the IWW, yet, she did not state the point, nor give the listener any idea where she was going with the rest of her speech.

Her second point did give the audience some idea of what would be discussed by stating: "Let me tell you something about the IWWs as I see them." This statement was not all conclusive, yet, it led into the second point which was a discussion of Keller's interpretation of the unfair publicity the IWW had received.

The last point was more difficult to determine, but Keller talked about the IWW's purpose when capitalism failed. She again did not introduce this point. She

concluded her entire speech by concluding this final main point.

Composite Analysis of Arrangement

In each of Keller's speeches it was difficult to determine the main points, primarily because of the lack of transitions. She concluded all her speeches with spirited words of encouragement related to the topic of each speech.

Style

Style refers to the way a speaker verbally expresses her thoughts.³⁰ Style is usually examined in terms of the following qualities of style: correctness, clearness, appropriateness, and embellishment.³¹

Since the texts of Keller's speeches were likely to have been edited, this limited the analysis of some elements of style.

Correctness

According to the criteria used, "correctness refers chiefly to word choice or usage." Correctness involves choosing the best word for a particular situation.³² In the text, Speech Criticism, the following criteria was offered by which correctness may be analyzed. These were:

1. proper use of connecting words;
2. use of specific rather than general words for things;
3. avoidance of ambiguity;
4. accurate classification of nouns as to gender; and
5. correct expression of plurality, fewness, and unity.³³

The question asked in an effort to analyze the effectiveness of the use of correctness in style was: How effective was the choice and usage of words in Keller's speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, she tended to use general words, rather than specific words, which added to the ambiguity of what she apparently was attempting to say. Several examples of Keller's use of general words were as follows: "I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the questions of the day, and to the great change that is taking place in the structure of society." It is unclear in this passage precisely what she meant by "the great change" and even the "structure of society." Keller was not specific enough in her wording to avoid being ambiguous. Later she continued:

The change will take place whether we understand or not. . . . We are marching toward a new freedom. . . . A new light is coming to millions who looked for light and found darkness, a life to them who looked for the grave, and were bitter in spirit.

Keller referred to "the change" throughout this speech, but never defined what was the change. Keller frequently used phrases like, "a new freedom," "a new light," and "bitter in spirit," which were vague and unclear.

As for Keller's proper use of grammar, expression of plurality and accurate classification of nouns, if there had been any errors in these elements in the original text, they were not found in the present texts, perhaps due to editing.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In this second address, Keller's style was consistent with the first speech, because she frequently used general words rather than specific wording. Some examples of Keller's use of general words follows:

Through all the ages they have been robbed of the just reward of their patriotism as they have been of the just reward of their labor. . . . It [the capitalist system] has no morals it will not sacrifice for gain. . . . I look upon true patriotism as the brotherhood of man and the service of all to all. . . . The worker has nothing to lose but his chains, and he has a world to win. . . . This great republic is a mockery of freedom, . . .

Keller did not seem to be concerned with using words to avoid ambiguity. This was especially apparent in the phrases, "just reward of their patriotism," "just reward of their labor," "true patriotism," and "nothing to lose but his chains." Keller was not specific in explaining exactly what it was that she was referring to in each of

these cases. As in the first speech, there was no remaining improper use of grammar and no improper use of plurals. The text probably would have been changed if there had been errors in the original. The only error Keller seemed to have with regard to correctness was with the use of general rather than precise wording.

"What is the IWW?"

In Keller's final speech, she again favored the use of general wording over exact wording, yet, it was not as frequent as in her other two speeches. As follows are a few examples of this general wording:

Thus they [the IWW] find themselves pitted against the whole profit-making system. . . . They [the IWW] know that the laws are for the strong, that they protect the class that owns everything. . . . By organizing industrially they are forming the structure of the new society in the shell of the old.

Keller used undefined phrases which were too general to determine what exactly it was that she was referring to, such as: "profit-making system," "the new society," and "shell of the old." When she used wording like: "laws are for the strong" it was unclear as to which laws, and who "the strong" included. Also, using phrases like: "the class that owns everything," made it difficult to determine who belonged to "the class" and what exactly encompassed "everything."

Keller's final text did not include any grammatical errors and again, the text probably would have been corrected from the original.

Composite Analysis of Correctness

In all three speeches, Keller's level of correctness in style followed the same pattern. It was difficult to determine what she was referring to since her wording was often too general. It was not determined if this was a deliberate attempt to be ambiguous, or if she was just not precise in what she was saying. As for the other qualities including: correct grammar, accurate classification of nouns and correct expression of plurality, these elements could not be analyzed, since the texts had probably been edited before publication.

Clearness

Clearness is closely related to correctness and also deals with the choice of words and to their arrangement. Clearness is being easily understood, and involves the avoidance of ambiguity in the message.

According to George Campbell, whose work, Philosophy of Rhetoric, is described by Thonssen, Baird and Braden, "one of the most detailed treatments of word choice and usage,"³⁴ there are three violations against clarity. These are as follows:

1. Obscurity--which may result because of "faulty arrangement of words," . . . "complicated sentence structure, use of technical words," and the use of "extremely long sentences."
2. Double meanings--the use of "varied and various interpretations" of the meanings of words; and
3. Failure of the speaker to convey meaning.³⁵

To determine the clarity of Keller's speeches, the following question was asked: How clearly did Keller express her ideas in each of her speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, she did not seem to obscure meaning through the use of technical terms or complicated sentence structure, nor did she use extremely long sentences in her speech. In Keller's speech, there were fifty-three sentences, and a total of seven hundred seventy words. If there was any failure in Keller's attempt to convey clearness in meaning, it was in her use of words and phrases which had possible double meanings or various interpretations. For example, throughout the speech, Keller referred to "the change" that was coming, but never clearly defined what she meant by it. She also talked about how the "new light is coming," and that, "we [the audience] are part of this light." What exactly she meant by the "light" was unclear, and may have been interpreted in a number of ways.

Also, Keller's extensive use of connotative words like, "freedom," "democracy" and "social injustice" led

to ambiguity since they could be interpreted in a variety of ways.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

Keller sometimes used complicated sentence structure in her second speech, which seemed to alter her ability to be easily understood. One instance when this occurred was in the following statement: "Then, the nation will be prepared to withstand the demand to fight for a perpetuation of its own slavery at the bidding of a tyrant." The sentence almost needs to be read more than once, and slowly, to understand the message. It could have been stated in a simpler fashion.

Keller did not obscure the meaning through the use of technical words, nor did she do this by using extremely long sentences. There were thirty-seven sentences, and seven hundred and nine words in Keller's second address.

Keller did use general terms in her second speech without defining them. This added to the possibility of various interpretations of the message. Examples of this were in the words and phrases: "just rewards of their patriotism," "the sanctity of a home," "liberty, justice and an abundant life for all," and "fruit of your toil." Each of these phrases could be interpreted in a number of ways, and were not clearly defined within the speech. Other examples of ambiguous wording included: "the state,"

"the master's religion," and even "the workers." None of these were ever defined in the speech.

"What is the IWW?"

Again, in this final speech, when Keller was not easily understood, it was in her use of words that had many interpretations. She did not, however, use technical language which sometimes obscures the message. Neither did she utilize complicated sentence structure or extremely long sentences, both of which could lend to the obscurity of the message.

Many of Keller's words could have been interpreted in a number of ways. Some phrases were used which did not appear to make sense, as in the following use of the phrase, "in blind content": "It is a movement of revolt against the ignorance, the poverty, the cruelty that too many of us accept in blind content." What is "blind content" and how can it be interpreted? It is not clear.

Again Keller used phrases which did not specifically infer who she was referring to, as: "unity among the masses," "economic masters," "master class," "the workers," and "the capitalist class." She was not specific in defining exactly who were included in each of these groups.

An example of Keller's use of phrases that could have had various interpretations, in her closing statement, are as follows:

In such a crisis the capitalist class cannot save itself or its institutions. Its police and armies will be powerless to put down the last revolt. For man at last will take his own, not considering the cost.

First, she did not define who belonged to the "capitalist class" and what its "institutions" were. Nor, did she make it clear why this class had its own police and army. The final statement could be interpreted in various ways, or it could have had no meaning at all to the listener.

Composite Analysis of Clearness

As in correctness of style, Keller seemed to fall short in choosing words to avoid ambiguity. In all three speeches, she utilized words and phrases that could be interpreted in numerous ways. In none of the speeches did she use technical language. In her second speech, there was some use of complicated sentence structure. Keller did not use extremely long sentences in any of her speeches.

Appropriateness

According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, appropriateness is the adaptation of the style to a particular audience situation. Language should be "appropriate to the subject," which means it "should be consistent to the nature of the address." Style should also "be appropriate to the type of oratory used, and to the particular audience addressed."

Also, style should be consistent with the speaker himself. In other words, it should help to reveal the character of the speaker; it should not seem to clash with his personality.³⁶

To evaluate the appropriateness of the language in each of Keller's speeches, the following question was asked: How effectively was the language adapted to the situation and to the audience?

"A New Light is Coming"

Keller appeared to have used language that was adapted to the situation and to the audience, the sociological conference, in her first speech. Throughout her speech, she used common language to express her thoughts. In her opening remarks, she appeared to have been attempting to be honest with her audience by admitting that she had not prepared a speech that day, as follows: "Dear Friends: I came here to listen, not to talk. I have not prepared a speech." With these few words, she may have been attempting to convince her listeners that since she had not prepared a speech, then the language would be more conversational and spontaneous.

Keller also appeared to have adapted the language to her audience, by using words of encouragement for a better future. This was most apparent in her closing remarks: "We are finding out what is wrong with the world.

We are going to make it right. . . . A new light is coming. . . ." She continued: "With our hearts let us see, with your hands let us break every chain. Then, indeed, shall we know a better and nobler humanity." She appears to have chosen appropriate language in these cases. She used words of encouragement to raise the hopes of her listeners, which seems to have been part of her goal in this address. Also, Keller's encouraging words were apparently consistent with many people's perception of Keller. As stated earlier in this study, Keller's messages were often words of encouragement.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

Keller's language in this speech appears to have been appropriate in adapting to the "audience of workers."³⁷ She used common language which should have been consistent with the language of the workers. She did not talk down to the audience, and the tone of her rhetoric was quite clearly sympathetic to the workers; as seen in the following passage: "If they [the workers] escape death [in war] they come back to face heavy taxation and have their burden of poverty doubled." The language used was consistent with the subject, which was an attack on the preparedness program. In this passage she effectively used concepts that the workers could identify with, "heavy taxation" and the "burden of poverty." Another example follows:

"Nothing is to be gained by the workers from war. They [the workers] suffer all the miseries, while the rulers reap the rewards." Again Keller's word choice was appropriate, by sympathizing with the plight of the workers.

Also, in this speech, it should be noted how appropriate Keller's choice of words was dependent upon who was the judge. To other Socialists and to the workers who were familiar with Keller's socialist convictions, Keller's choice of words may have appeared consistent with her character. Yet, to those who were skeptical of Keller's socialist convictions, and believed she was only being used by the Socialist Party, her language may have seemed inconsistent with their perception of Helen Keller. So, although Keller's language was appropriate to the subject, and to some listeners, the oratory used may not have been perceived as consistent with the speaker.

"What is the IWW?"

Keller's choice of words in her final speech meshed somewhat with the situation and the audience. The examples of news events about the IWW, like the strike activities, were easily explained, and she did not talk down to her audience. At times, however, Keller's language did sound defensive. Examples of this follow:

Thus they [the IWW] find themselves pitted against the whole profit-making system. . . . They know that in a contest with the workers, employers do

not respect the laws, but quite shamelessly break them.

To the audience, the New York City Civic Club, this may not have been appropriate. It could have appeared inconsistent with the nature of the address--an explanation of the IWW. Rather than being informative, it seemed to take on a biased tone which could have been viewed inappropriate by the listener.

Toward the conclusion of her speech, the language took on an almost threatening tone, almost like a warning to the listeners. The passage follows:

Remember, the day will come when the tremendous activities of the war will subside. Capitalism will inevitably find itself face to face with a starving multitude of unemployed workers, . . . When that day dawns, if the workers are not thoroughly organized, they may easily become a blind force of destruction, unable to check their own momentum, their cry for justice drowned in a howl of rage.

Again it is not certain if this strong language would have been appropriate for her audience. It is not known if the audience would have been so concerned about the particular predictions of the future as Keller saw it. Also, in this speech, it is not known if such defensive language would have been perceived as appropriate for the audience's view of Helen Keller. However, it could have been quite effective. It would be difficult to determine without further information about the audience.

language would be unique, unless she had been assisted in the writing of her speeches.

For purposes of this study, the use of figures was limited to metaphors and similies. Keller did not extensively utilize figures in her first speech, as she used no similies, and used a metaphor in the following instance: "Dull indeed are their hearts who turn their backs upon misery." Hearts are not "dull" in reality, but Keller used this as a comparison of those who ignore poverty and injustice.

Keller infrequently used vivid language and figures in her first address.

"Menace of the Militarist Program"

In Keller's second speech, it seems that she attempted to utilize vivid language to develop her ideas. In the opening remarks, she described what the workers had in store for themselves if there was going to be a war:

They [the workers] are taught that their masters can do no wrong, and go out in vast numbers to be killed on the battlefield. And what is their reward? If they escape death they come back to face heavy taxation and have the burden of poverty doubled.

Keller again, as in her first speech, made reference to sight and hearing in what may have been an attempt to create word-pictures. In Keller's opening remarks, although she did not specifically use the words "blind" and "deaf," she was still implying them. In this passage she was

Embellishment

Embellishment's primary purpose is to "adorn or elevate." For purposes of this study, the analysis will be in terms of the vividness of the language chosen and the effective use of figures.³⁸

To evaluate the use of embellishment in Keller's speeches, the following question was asked: How effectively did Keller use vivid language and figures in her speeches?

"A New Light is Coming"

In Keller's first speech, she did not frequently utilize vivid language. She used vivid language in her closing remarks when she talked about the "new light." Her closing remarks follow:

A new light is coming to millions who looked for the grave, and were bitter in spirit. We are part of this light. Let us go forth from here shafts of the sun unto shadows. With our hearts let us see, with your hands let us break every chain. . . . Men will not go on strike for 50 cents more a week. Little children will not have to starve or work in mill and factory.

It may have been possible for the listener to create word-pictures from this passage. It should be noted, however, that Keller's method of using vivid language did not involve a detailed description of some specific incident. As in this case, she utilized words like "light," "shafts of the sun," and "let us see," rather than describing a detailed picture. Of course, Keller's use of vivid

pointing out how the workers blindly go off to war; blinded by the masters. In another instance, she described the capitalists' stake in the war:

Behind the active agitators for defense you will find J. P. Morgan and Company, and the capitalists who have invested their money in shrapnel plants, and others that turn out implements of murder.

Her use of "vivid language" seems to have been most apparent in her words, "and others that turn out implements of murder."

In Keller's closing statements, she may have been attempting to use "vivid language" to determine what it was that the workers hoped to gain from a war:

The laws that send you to jail when you demand better living conditions? The flag? Does it wave over a country where you are free and have a home, or does it rather symbolize a country that meets you with clenched fists when you strike for better wages and shorter hours? Will you fight for your master's religion which teaches you to obey them even when they tell you to kill one another?

Some of these phrases might create word-pictures, such as, "clenched fists," "strike," "kill one another," yet, again Keller's "method" of using "vivid language" is unique. It seems that she used certain phrases to create images, rather than to vividly describe a particular incident.

Keller infrequently used figures, yet, she did use this metaphor, as follows: "I look upon the whole world as my fatherland, and every war has to me a horror of a family feud." The metaphor is "horror of a family feud."

Although "war" is not in reality a "feud," Keller utilized this comparison.

Two similes were found in Keller's speech, as follows: "I look upon the whole world as my fatherland, and every war has to me a horror of a family feud. I look upon true patriotism as the brotherhood of man and the service of all to all." The similes in these statements are "as my fatherland" which Keller compared the "whole world" to, and "as the brotherhood of man" which she compared to "true patriotism."

In Keller's second address, she made some attempt at using vivid language, and used some figures.

"What is the IWW?"

Keller again seems to have been trying to utilize vivid language in her final speech. In descriptions of the IWW and its activities, she seems to have tried to create images to develop her ideas. In her opening statements, she said: "Its [the IWW] battleground is the field of industry, the visible expression of the battle is the strike, the lock-out, the clash between employer and employed." The words, "battleground," "strike," "lock-out," and "clash" might conjure up visual images. Another example follows: "It is for these principles, this declaration of class solidarity, that the IWWs are being persecuted, beaten, imprisoned, murdered." Although this

was not a detailed description, the words used like "persecuted, beaten, imprisoned, murdered" may have helped to give the listener some visual idea of the acts that had been committed. Keller was probably most effective in using vivid language when she gave the following examples of acts that had been committed against the IWW members:

Witness the lynching of Frank Little in Butte; the flogging of seventeen men in Tulsa; the deportation of 1200 miners from Bisbee; the burning to death of women and little children in the tents of Ludlow, Colorado, and the massacre of workers in Trinidad.

These were all incidents that had been in the news, and Keller's use of words like "lynching," "flogging," "burning to death," and "massacre" may have helped to develop clear images for the listener.

Keller's final remarks included vivid language:

Capitalism will inevitably find itself face to face with a starving multitude of unemployed workers demanding food or destruction of the social order that has starved them and robbed them of their jobs.

Keller seems to have utilized vivid language most effectively in her final speech. Although she again used individual words and phrases to create visual images, she also seemed to have tried to invent word-pictures of actual incidents. One example of this was when she described the atrocities that had been committed against IWW members.

Keller infrequently utilized figures in her final address. One example of her use of similes follows: "So the IWWs respect the law only as a soldier respects an enemy." Keller likened "the IWWs respect" for the law to that of a soldier's respect for an enemy. Another example was when she compared the IWWs to slaves: "They have been starved in body and mind, denied, exploited, driven like slaves from job to job."

Keller did not use metaphors in this address.

Composite Analysis of Embellishment

Keller infrequently utilized vivid language in her speeches, but she did use it in some portion of each speech. It was characteristic in most of the examples of vivid language that they were not detailed descriptions of some incident, rather, she concentrated on key words in her language, and frequently utilized the words "blind" and "deaf," or made some reference to these concepts.

She used some figures in all her speeches, but it was not extensive in any of the three addresses.

Delivery

Thonssen, Baird and Braden held that there has always been a need for effective delivery, and when evaluating delivery, the critic must obtain information on the vocal characteristics of the speaker and the speaker's

bodily actions as the speech was presented. The critic should evaluate the speaker's delivery on how these characteristics:

. . . served as causal factors in gaining attention, holding interest, and in stirring the speaker's desired response, and what part they played in the emerging image of the speaker.³⁹

Keller's situation was unique with regard to delivery. Consequently it was necessary to determine: How Keller learned to speak following her illness, the general pattern she followed prior to and during a lecture and the characteristics of her voice and appearance?

The selected speeches were not heard on a first-hand basis, so an attempt was made to evaluate Keller's speaking by other methods. A combination of newspaper accounts and biographies provided information on her methods of delivery in general. These accounts were taken into consideration when evaluating the effectiveness of Keller's mode of delivery.

Keller's Speaking Education

Keller began to learn to speak in 1890.⁴⁰ According to Keller, in her autobiography, Story of My Life, Sarah Fuller, principal from the Horace Mann School of the Deaf, in Boston, gave Keller her first eleven lessons in

speaking.⁴¹ With Anne Sullivan's guidance, Keller quickly learned to speak.⁴²

Although Keller learned to speak, she still believed she had to speak more clearly. In the fall of 1894, she entered the Wright-Humason School in New York which specialized in lip-reading and voice culture. At this time, she also took singing lessons to "strengthen" her voice.⁴³ According to Keller's other autobiography, Midstream, after two years of training at Wright-Humason, Keller was finally pleased with her improvements.⁴⁴

Keller's first platform speaking appearance was in Montclair, New Jersey in February 1913. It was a demonstration of her speaking ability.⁴⁵ The appearance was followed by more speaking engagements. She soon became a familiar lecturer.

General Pattern Prior to Lectures

In Joseph Lash's book, Helen and Teacher, he described Keller's general pattern of public speaking:

She did not inject her Socialist views into her formal lecture. That had a set pattern. Teacher went onto the stage first and spoke in her musical voice about the education of Helen. She then led Helen onto the platform. To accustom the audience to the strangeness of Helen's voice, she had Helen repeat slowly sentences that Helen read with her fingers on Teacher's [Sullivan's] lips. Then Helen repeated the lines of "Abide With Me."⁴⁶

The audience was then ready to hear Keller's message.

Although it was not determined that Keller prepared her audiences in the same manner before her socialist lectures, two accounts referring to two of the speeches analyzed were found. In her first speech, Keller was "led to the platform," and prior to her second speech, Sullivan introduced Keller.

In Keller's first speech, "A New Light is Coming," the New York Call briefly described that Keller was led to the platform prior to her speech: "She created a profound impression; the audience rose and cheered while she was being led to the platform."⁴⁷

In the second speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program," Anne Sullivan introduced Keller before she spoke. As reported in the New York Call:

Before she spoke, her teacher, Mrs. John A. Macy [Anne Sullivan], told of how she had taught her pupil, who was blind, deaf and dumb since the age of 19 months, to understand those things which normal children learn to know without any teaching, and how difficult the task had been and also how successful.⁴⁸

In Keller's final speech, "What is the IWW?", no accounts relating to Keller's introduction prior to the lecture were found.

Being led to the platform, then being introduced to the audience, accompanied with an explanation of how Keller learned to "understand," surely must have left some impact on her listeners. The audience may have prepared

themselves to be as quiet as possible so not to miss Keller's message. No doubt some listeners prepared themselves to watch the techniques Keller used, thinking of her more as a novelty, rather than concentrating on the message.

Characteristics of Keller's Voice and Appearance

This section was concerned with obtaining accounts of Keller's vocal characteristics and appearance, to evaluate how these factors affected Keller's speech.

In the supplement of Keller's autobiography, The Story of My Life, John Macy, Sullivan's husband, gave the following accounts of his impressions about Keller's speaking:

Her voice is low and pleasant to listen to. Her speech lacks variety and modulation, it runs in a sing-song when she is reading aloud, . . . The principal thing that is lacking is sentence accent and variety in the inflection of phrases.⁴⁹

He added: "I am told that Miss Keller speaks better than most other deaf people."⁵⁰

In the New York Call's reporting of Keller's first speech, "A New Light is Coming," the following comments were made on her mode of delivery: "She spoke slowly, but with a clear, distinct utterance, easily understood in all parts of the Hall. . . . No one seeing her as she spoke would have realized that she was both deaf and blind."⁵¹

The New York Call gave the following account of Keller's vocal characteristics during her speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program": "Her newfound voice forms the words fairly distinctly, but last night William Fagan repeated after her each sentence, so that the audience would be sure to understand the noted deaf and blind Socialist."⁵² No accounts of Keller's mode of delivery were found concerning the last speech, "What is the IWW?".

On February 6, 1983, there was an opportunity to hear Keller speak a few words on a children's television program. On cable's arts station, Nickelodeon, a program aired about Helen Keller, which included a rare recording of Anne Sullivan explaining how she taught Helen to speak. Helen spoke a few words which were clear, distinct and understandable. Yet, as the previous research has indicated, her voice was monotone, absent of inflections and variety, and the rate was at a controlled pace.

As for Keller's appearance, again no accounts were found which related to how she looked the day of the speeches, but the following comment was made on Keller's appearance in general. In Brooks' book, Helen Keller: Sketch for a Portrait, he stated that Keller was one who wore attractive, stylish clothes, which Sullivan chose for her.⁵³

It appears that Keller's voice was low, monotone, and the rate was slow. Her voice lacked vocal variety and

inflection. It is sometimes difficult to listen to a speech given in monotone delivery, so this may have adversely affected the attention the audience gave to the speech. Also, the audience may have missed some of the message if they missed some of her words. However, the novelty effect may also have sharpened the audiences' attentiveness.

Composite Analysis of Delivery

It should be noted that if Keller's goals in any one of these speeches were not realized because they were hindered by her delivery, her listeners may have also been affected positively because of the delivery. The fact that Keller had learned to communicate to so many people was, no doubt, an inspiration in itself.

Effects of the Rhetoric

In attempting to judge the effect of Keller's speeches in terms of her success in obtaining the expressed goals, accounts of immediate responses were examined. According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden, the immediate response refers to that which was elicited at the time and place that the speech was given.⁵⁴

The long-range effects of rhetoric refers to the effects the speech has upon society. The speech may or may not have an influence upon society over a period of years after the time the speech was delivered.⁵⁵

Immediate Effects

The New York Call reported a favorable response to Keller's first two speeches. At Keller's speech, "A New Light is Coming," at the Sociological Conference, the New York Call reported the audience's response prior to her message: "The audience rose and cheered while she was being led to the platform."⁵⁶ The report did not, however, record the audience's response following the speech.

The New York Call also reported Keller's reception prior to her second speech, "Menace of the Militarist Program": "[the auditorium] was crowded to the last available seat. Several hundred persons had to be turned away for lack of room long before the meeting opened."⁵⁷ The Call also recorded the audience's response after her speech, as follows: "Prolonged applause greeted the last sentences of Miss Keller's talk."⁵⁸

No account on the response of Keller's speech, "What is the IWW?" was available.

From these reports it appears that Keller's first two messages were well-received by the audiences, yet, this is admittedly an incomplete measure of the immediate effects in terms of persuasive effects.

Long-Range Effects

The purpose of Keller's first speech was to explain why she had the right to speak at the conference, and also,

to convince her listeners that an improved quality of life was coming for everyone. As previously mentioned in this analysis, Keller struggled with her credibility throughout her Socialist speaking career. Since there were those who never believed that she was sincere in her socialist convictions, Keller's first goal was not fully appreciated by everyone. Whether the "quality of life" improved for everyone following this speech, is difficult to determine, except on a personal basis. Certainly the Socialist movement did not become a nationally-adopted cause.

The central theme of Keller's second speech was to persuade the workers to oppose the preparedness program. Following the speech, Keller was asked to deliver a second speech similar to the first one to those who were unable to hear the first speech. As reported in the book, Woman as Revolutionary:

Several weeks later, in response to a request from the Women's Peace Party and the Labor Forum that she speak again for the benefit of those who had missed her performance at Washington Irving High School, Helen gave a similar address at Carnegie Hall.⁵⁹

Such a request may be considered a positive response to Keller's first speech. Except for this reaction, it is difficult to predict if Keller persuaded any of the workers to oppose the preparedness program, which seems to have been her purpose.

In Keller's final speech, "What is the IWW?", Keller's purpose was to: explain what the IWW was, to explain the unfair publicity they had received and to point out why they were a vital organization. The IWW did not remain a popular organization as Keller had predicted. Following this speech, the negative public attitudes continued toward the IWW and it did not become the significant organization that Keller had predicted.

The immediate responses to Keller's first two speeches were positive, yet, in terms of persuasive effects this was an incomplete conclusion. It was not possible to positively conclude what the long-range effects of Keller's rhetoric encompassed. In her first and second speeches, it would be difficult to determine if persons' lives were changed by her speeches. The Socialist movement continued, yet, it did not become a nationally-adopted cause. Neither did the IWW become the significant organization Keller believed it would become, as indicated in her final speech.

ENDNOTES

¹Frederick C. Giffin, ed., Woman as Revolutionary (New York: A Mentor Book, 1973), pp. 133-134.

²Philip S. Foner, ed., Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years (New York: International Publishers Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 91-93.

³New York Call, July 9, 1913, p. 5.

⁴Ibid.

⁵New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 2.

⁶Ibid., p. 1.

⁷Giffin, Woman as Revolutionary, p. 121.

⁸Foner, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years, p. 91.

⁹Ibid., p. 93.

¹⁰Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird and Waldo W. Braden, Speech Criticism, 2d ed. (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1970), p. 86.

¹¹Ibid., p. 393.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., p. 402.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 399.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 402-403.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 408.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 446.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 458-459.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 459.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 459-460.

- ²¹Ibid., p. 428.
- ²²Ibid., p. 429.
- ²³New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 1.
- ²⁴Foner, Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years, p. 91.
- ²⁵Thonssen, Baird and Braden, p. 468.
- ²⁶Ibid., p. 471.
- ²⁷Ibid., pp. 471-472.
- ²⁸Ibid., pp. 472-473.
- ²⁹Ibid., p. 477.
- ³⁰Ibid., p. 489.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 494.
- ³²Ibid.
- ³³Ibid.
- ³⁴Ibid.
- ³⁵Ibid., pp. 498-499.
- ³⁶Ibid., pp. 500-502.
- ³⁷New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 1.
- ³⁸Thonssen, Baird and Braden, p. 502.
- ³⁹Ibid., p. 522.
- ⁴⁰Helen Keller, The Story of My Life (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1903), p. 58.
- ⁴¹Ibid., p. 59.
- ⁴²Ibid., pp. 60-61.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 224.
- ⁴⁴Helen Keller, Midstream: My Later Life (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 92.

- ⁴⁵Ibid., p. 96.
- ⁴⁶Joseph P. Lash, Helen and Teacher (New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1980), p. 431.
- ⁴⁷New York Call, July 8, 1913, p. 5.
- ⁴⁸New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 2.
- ⁴⁹Keller, The Story of My Life, p. 384.
- ⁵⁰Ibid., p. 385.
- ⁵¹New York Call, July 8, 1913, p. 5.
- ⁵²New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 1.
- ⁵³Van Wyck Brooks, Helen Keller: Sketch for a Portrait (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1956), p. 76.
- ⁵⁴Thonssen, Baird and Braden, p. 541.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 542-544.
- ⁵⁶New York Call, July 8, 1913, p. 5.
- ⁵⁷New York Call, December 20, 1915, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸Ibid., p. 2.
- ⁵⁹Giffin, Woman as Revolutionary, p. 121.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness and the effect of the socialist rhetoric of Helen Keller as revealed in three speeches given on behalf of the Socialist movement.

Although Helen Keller may be best-known for her work on behalf of the blind and the deaf, she did concentrate on speaking for the Socialist Party for almost a decade after she became a socialist in 1909. During this period, she was an advocate of the Socialist Party and supported the activities of many socialists, even those of the militant organization, the Industrial Workers of the World. Keller's involvement ranged from writing essays and letters to newspapers on behalf of socialist causes, to platform speaking.

After World War I, Keller's active speaking engagements for the Socialist movement slowly decreased. She finally decided to concentrate her energies on helping the blind and the deaf. Yet, Keller did not cease being a socialist, and remained a supporter of the Socialist Party throughout her life.

Three speeches were chosen at random for this analysis. These speeches were: "A New Light is Coming," "Menace of the Militarist Program," and "What is the IWW?" Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird and Waldo W. Braden's Speech Criticism, was used as a basis for the criticism of these speeches. The speeches were analyzed in an attempt to judge the effectiveness of Keller's choices regarding invention, arrangement, style and delivery.

The logical proof in all three speeches seemed to be weak because of insufficient supporting evidence. In her first speech, Keller arrived at the conclusion that because some people were realizing the problems in society that this realization would lead to an improved quality of life for all. In the second speech, Keller appeared to arrive at the general conclusion that it was the workers who had the most to lose in a war and, therefore, the greatest reason to fear a preparedness program. Keller's final speech concluded that the IWW was a viable organization that was essential for the future of the entire world.

There was an emphasis on ethical proof in Keller's first speech, but it was not as prominent in the final two speeches. In her last two speeches, Keller may have been less concerned with establishing ethical proof since she was already a well-known personality to many of her listeners, as a socialist and because of her victory over her disabilities.

Emotional proof was dominant in Keller's first and second speeches. Keller appeared to view her audience as being skeptical of her credibility on political issues in the first speech. She also seemed aware that her audience in both speeches were ready for a change in society, advocated socialist values and advocated "the worker" and not the employer. Not enough information was available on the final speeches' audience to make a conclusion on its effectiveness in utilizing emotional proof.

All three speeches were arranged topically, yet, it was not apparent in any of the speeches exactly what was the thesis. In each of Keller's speeches, it was difficult to determine the main points and the transitions because they were not fully developed.

Correctness, clearness and embellishment appeared to be the weakest qualities of style in the speeches. In her first two speeches she appeared to have effectively utilized appropriate language, consistent with her audience.

It can be concluded that Keller's delivery techniques were unique. Her methods were unlike other lecturers because she was blind and deaf.

The immediate effects of Keller's first two speeches were demonstrated by the positive feedback from her audiences. Her second speech had a long-range effect, which

was that her listeners demanded a similar speech to be given at a later date so more people could hear her message. However, Keller's ultimate influence in the Socialist movement is not known.

Conclusions

Several conclusions have been drawn from this analysis of the effectiveness of the rhetoric in the three selected speeches. It can be concluded that:

1. In all three speeches Keller did not rely heavily on logical proof. The conclusions in her speeches were reached without sufficient supporting evidence.

2. Keller's use of ethical proof met the established criteria and was effectively utilized in the first speech. Part of the reason it may not have been effectively utilized in the last two speeches was because Keller was already well-known among her socialist listeners, and may have felt she did not have to spend time establishing ethical proof.

3. Keller effectively utilized emotional proof in her first and second speeches. She confronted her audiences' skepticism of her through her frank honesty and appeared to establish an identity with the working class.

4. All the speeches were arranged topically, yet, the structure in all three speeches was obscure or non-existent. The thesis was not easily distinguishable, nor

were the main points and transitions developed or easily recognizable.

5. Appropriateness was Keller's strongest stylistic quality.

6. Keller's delivery methods were unique because of her disabilities.

7. The effect of the rhetoric could not be determined on a long-range basis, yet, the immediate response for the first and second speeches was positive.

Recommendations for Future Study

This study must be interpreted in terms of its limitations. This is due primarily to the specialized analysis in one period of Keller's lecturing career, that of her socialist speaking. Additional studies may contribute to a better understanding of Keller's rhetoric.

Since this is a study of a particular period of Keller's rhetorical career, it may be beneficial to analyze other periods of her rhetoric. Keller's speaking during her vaudeville career or during her lecturing on behalf of the Foundation for the Blind may provide a more complete understanding of Keller's rhetorical practices. Further, a study could be conducted to compare Keller's socialist speaking methods to that of a contemporary of Keller's who also spoke for the Socialist movement. Such a study could

identify differences and similarities in methods and effects of the two speakers.

APPENDIX A

"A NEW LIGHT IS COMING"

Address at the Sociological Conference, Sagamore Beach,
Massachusetts

Dear Friends: I came here to listen, not to talk. I have not prepared a speech. But I suppose a woman can always think of something to say. If other subjects fail, one can talk about oneself.

Ever since I came here, people have been asking my friends how I can have a first-hand knowledge of the subjects you are discussing. They seem to think that one deaf and blind cannot know about the world of people, of ideas, of facts. Well, I plead guilty to the charge that I am deaf and blind, though I forget the fact most of the time. It is true, I cannot hear my neighbors discussing the questions of the day. But, judging from what is repeated to me of their discussions, I feel that I do not miss much. I can read. I can read the views of well-informed thinkers like Alfred Russell Wallace, Sir Oliver Lodge, Ruskin, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Karl Kautsky, Darwin and Karl Marx. Besides books, I have magazines, raised print published in America, England, France, Germany and Austria.

Of course, I am not always on the spot when things happen, nor are you. I did not witness the dreadful accident at Stamford the other day, nor did you, nor did most people in the United States. But that did not prevent me, any more it prevented you, from knowing about it.

To be sure, I have never been a captain of industry, or a soldier, or a strikebreaker. But I have studied these professions, and I think I understand their relation to society. At all events, I claim my right to discuss them. I have the advantage of a mind trained to think, and that is the difference between myself and most people, not my blindness and their sight. It seems to me that they are blind indeed who do not see that there must be something very wrong when the workers--the men and women who produce the wealth of the nation--are ill paid, ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed. Deaf indeed are they who do not hear the desperation in the voice of the people crying out against cruel poverty and social injustice. Dull indeed are their hearts who turn their backs upon misery and support a system that grinds the life and soul out of men and women.

I have been much interested in what I have heard here. I am glad so many of you have your eyes open to the questions of the day, and to the great change that is taking place in the structure of society. There is always hope of improvement when people are willing to try to

understand. The change will take place whether we understand or not. Comrade Giovannitti has explained to you how he believes that great change is coming. If you understood him, you will see that it is the workers themselves who will work out their own salvation. All we can do is to get into the procession.

We are marching toward a new freedom. We are learning that freedom is the only safe condition for all human beings, men and women and children. Only through freedom, freedom for all, can we hope for a true democracy. Some of us have imagined that we live in a democracy. We do not. A democracy would mean equal opportunity for all. It would mean that every child had a chance to be well born, well fed, well taught and properly started in life. It would mean that every woman had a voice in the making of the laws under which she lives. It would mean that all men enjoyed the fruits of their labor. Such a democracy has never existed.

But some of us are waking up. We are finding out what is wrong with the world. We are going to make it right. We are learning that we live by each other, and that the life for each other is the only life worth living. A new light is coming to millions who looked for light and found darkness, a life to them who looked for the grave, and were bitter in the spirit. We are part of this light. Let us go forth from here shafts of the sun unto shadows. With our hearts let us see, with your hands let us break every chain. Then, indeed, shall we know a better and nobler humanity. For there will be no more slaves. Men will not go on strike for 50 cents more a week. Little children will not have to starve or work in mill and factory. Motherhood will no longer be a sorrow. We shall be "just one great family of friends and brothers."

--New York Call, July 8, 1913

APPENDIX B

"MENACE OF THE MILITARIST PROGRAM"

Speech at the Labor Forum, Washington Irving High School,
New York City, December 19, 1915

The burden of war always falls heaviest on the toilers. They are taught that their masters can do no wrong, and go out in vast numbers to be killed on the battlefield. And what is their reward? If they escape death they come back to face heavy taxation and have their burden of poverty doubled. Through all the ages they have been robbed of the just rewards of their patriotism as they have been of the just reward of their labor.

The only moral virtue of war is that it compels the capitalist system to look itself in the face and admit it is a fraud. It compels the present society to admit that it has no morals it will not sacrifice for gain. During a war, the sanctity of a home, and even of private property is destroyed. Governments do what it is said the "crazy Socialists" would do if in power.

In spite of the historical proof of the futility of war, the United States is preparing to raise a billion dollars and a million soldiers in preparation for war. Behind the active agitators for defense you will find J. P. Morgan & Co., and the capitalists who have invested their money in shrapnel plants, and others that turn out implements of murder. They want armaments because they beget war, for these capitalists want to develop new markets for their hideous traffic.

I look upon the whole world as my fatherland, and every war has to me a horror of a family feud. I look upon true patriotism as the brotherhood of man and the service of all to all. The only fighting that saves is the one that helps the world toward liberty, justice and an abundant life for all.

To prepare this nation in the true sense of the word, not for war, but for peace and happiness, the State should govern every department of industry, health and education in such a way as to maintain the bodies and minds of the people in soundness and efficiency. Then, the nation will be prepared to withstand the demand to fight for a perpetuation of its own slavery at the bidding of a tyrant.

After all, the best preparedness is one that disarms the hostility of other nations and makes friends of them. Nothing is to be gained by the workers from war. They suffer all the miseries, while the rulers reap the rewards. Their wages are not increased, nor their toil make lighter, nor their homes made more comfortable. The army they are

supposed to raise can be used to break strikes as well as defend the people.

If the democratic measures of preparedness fall before the advance of a world empire, the worker has nothing to fear. No conqueror can beat down his wages more ruthlessly or oppress him more than his own fellow citizens of the capitalist world are doing. The worker has nothing to lose but his chains, and he has a world to win. He can win it at one stroke from a world empire. We must form a fully equipped, militant international union so that we can take possession of such a world empire.

This great republic is a mockery of freedom as long as you are doomed to dig and sweat to earn a miserable living while the masters enjoy the fruit of your toil. What have you to fight for? National independence? That means the masters' independence. The laws that send you to jail when you demand better living conditions? The flag? Does it wave over a country where you are free and have a home, or does it rather symbolize a country that meets you with clenched fists when you strike for better wages and shorter hours? Will you fight for your masters' religion which teaches you to obey them even when they tell you to kill one another?

Why don't you make a junk heap of your masters' religion, his civilization, his kings and his customs that tend to reduce a man to a brute and God to a monster? Let there go forth a clarion call for liberty. Let the workers form one great world-wide union, and let there be a globe-encircling revolt to gain for the workers true liberty and happiness.

--New York Call, December 20, 1915

APPENDIX C

"WHAT IS THE IWW?"

Speech at the New York City Civic Club, January 1918

I am going to talk about the Industrial Workers of the World because they are so much in the public eye just now. They are probably the most hated and most loved organization in existence. Certainly they are the least understood and the most persistently misrepresented.

The Industrial Workers of the World is a labor union based on the class struggle. It admits only wage-earners, and acts on the principle of industrial unionism. Its battleground is the field of industry. The visible expression of the battle is the strike, the lock-out, the clash between employer and employed. It is a movement of revolt against the ignorance, the poverty, the cruelty that too many of us accept in blind content.

It was founded in 1905 by men of bitter experience in the labor struggle, and in 1909 it began to attract nation-wide attention. The McKees Rocks strike first brought it to notice. The textile strike of Lawrence, Massachusetts, the silk workers' strike of Paterson, New Jersey, and the miners' strike of Calumet, Michigan, made it notorious. Since 1909 it has been a militant force in America that employers have had to reckon with.

It differs from the trade unions in that it emphasizes the idea of one big union of all industries in the economic field. It points out that the trade unions as presently organized are an obstacle to unity among the masses, and that this lack of solidarity plays into the hands of their economic masters.

The IWW's affirm as a fundamental principle that the creators of wealth are entitled to all they create. Thus they find themselves pitted against the whole profit-making system. They declare that there can be no compromise so long as the majority of the working class lives in want while the master class lives in luxury. They insist that there can be no peace until the workers organize as a class, take possession of the resources of the earth and the machinery of production and distribution and abolish the wage system. In other words, the workers in their collectivity must own and operate all the essential industrial institutions and secure to each laborer the full value of his product.

It is for these principles, this declaration of class solidarity, that the IWWs are being persecuted, beaten, imprisoned, murdered. If the capitalist class had the sense it is reputed to have, it would know that violence is the worst weapon that can be used against men who have nothing to lose and the world to gain.

Let me tell you something about the IWWs as I see them. They are the unskilled, the ill-paid, the unnaturalized, the submerged part of the working class. They are mostly composed of textile mill workers, lumber men, harvesters, miners, transport workers. We are told that they are "foreigners," "the scum of the earth," "dangerous."

Many of them are foreigners simply because the greater part of the unskilled labor in this country is foreign. "Scum of the earth?" Perhaps. I know they have never had a fair chance. They have been starved in body and mind, denied, exploited, driven like slaves from job to job. "Dangerous?" Maybe. They have endured countless wrongs and injuries until they are driven to rebellion. They know that the laws are for the strong, that they protect the class that owns everything. They know that in a contest with the workers, employers do not respect the laws, but quite shamelessly break them.

Witness the lynching of Frank Little in Butte; the flogging of 17 men in Tulsa; the forcible deportation of 1200 miners from Bisbee; the burning to death of women and little children in the tents of Ludlow, Colorado, and the massacre of workers in Trinidad. So the IWWs respect the law only as a soldier respects an enemy! Can you find it in your hearts to blame them? I love them for their needs, their miseries, their endurance and their daring spirit. It is because of this spirit that the master class fears and hates them. It is because of this spirit that the poor and oppressed love them with a great love.

The oft-repeated charge that the Industrial Workers of the World is organized to hinder industry is false. It is organized in order to keep industries going. By organizing industrially they are forming the structure of the new society in the shell of the old.

Industry rests on the iron law of economic determination. All history reveals that economic interests are the strongest ties that bind men together. That is not because men's hearts are evil and selfish. It is only a result of the inexorable law of life. The desire to live is the basic principle that compels men and women to seek a more suitable environment, so that they may live better and more happily.

Now, don't you see, it is impossible to maintain an economic order that keeps wages practically at a standstill, while the cost of living mounts higher and even higher? Remember, the day will come when the tremendous activities of the war will subside. Capitalism will inevitably find itself face to face with a starving multitude of unemployed workers demanding food or destruction of the social order that has starved them and robbed them of their jobs.

In such a crisis the capitalist class cannot save itself or its institutions. Its police and armies will be powerless to put down the last revolt. For man at last will take his own, not considering the cost. When that day dawns, if the workers are not thoroughly organized, they may easily become a blind force of destruction, unable to check their own momentum, their cry for justice drowned in a howl of rage. Whatever is good and beneficent in our civilization can be saved only by the workers. And the Industrial Workers of the World is formed with the object of carrying on the business of the world when capitalism is overthrown. Whether the IWW increases in power or is crushed out of existence, the spirit that animates it is the spirit that must animate the labor movement if it is to have a revolutionary function.

--New York Call, February 3, 1918

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Brooks, VanWyck. Helen Keller Sketch for a Portrait.
New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1956.
- Foner, Philip S. Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years.
New York: International Publishers Company, Inc., 1967.
- Giffin, Frederick C., ed. Woman as Revolutionary. New York: A Mentor Book, 1973.
- Goldman, Emma. Living My Life. New York: Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., 1931.
- Keller, Helen. Midstream: My Later Life. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- _____. The Story of My Life. New York: Doubleday, Pageans Company, 1903.
- Lash, Joseph P. Helen and Teacher. New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1980.
- Radosh, Ronald, ed. Debs. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Ind., 1971.
- Renshaw, Patrick. The Wobblies. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower. Contemporary Political Ideologies. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1978.
- Shannon, David A. The Socialist Party of America. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1955.
- Thonssen, Lester; Baird, A. Craig; and Braden, Waldo W. Speech Criticism, 2nd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1970.

Magazines and Newspapers

Dworkin, Susan. "The Passion for a Thinking Woman's Theatre." Ms., November 1982, p. 70.

New York Call, 8 July 1913.

_____. 9 July 1913.

_____. 20 December, 1915.

New York Times. 9 September 1909.

_____. 13 January 1912.

_____. 21 April 1914.

_____. 8 May 1915.

_____. 20 December 1915.

_____. 2 June 1917.

_____. 1 July 1917.

_____. 13 July 1917.

_____. 2 August 1917.

_____. 30 June 1918.